

Basham, Harry Yates, and G. S. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Gus A. Vance; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1137. A bill granting a pension to Julia Lyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1138. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Blacketer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1139. A bill granting a pension to Rebecca J. Tilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1140. A bill granting a pension to Louise F. Mansfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1141. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Quattlebaum; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Carl Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1143. A bill for the relief of Clarence T. Summer, the Prosperity Depository, and D. H. Hamm; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1145. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Colburn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1146. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1147. A bill for the relief of the Sheehan Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1149. A bill for the relief of Dane D. Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Murphy & Wischmeyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of James Lemuel Muzzall and James M. Muzzall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of the parents of Dorothy White; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Adney W. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of Winston Cann; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Leo Joseph Berry; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1156. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Fannah A. Fuller; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands petitioning the Congress of the United States to extend to the American citizens and voters of the Virgin Islands the right to participate in the national elections and permit them to vote for a President and Vice President of the United States of America; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2. Also, memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands petitioning the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for a Resident Commissioner; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, upon earth we praise Thee that in a sin-stained world our souls find peace and forgiveness at Thy holy altar. In this communion Thy children rise clarified in vision and with an aspiration above the "common clod." We pray that we may put aside every disappointment, every wound, and every suggestion of failure and give to our fellow countrymen noble examples of unity and unsullied devotion to our country's need. O help us to do the right, to deal justly, and to abound in industry and bend our whole soul to a serious understanding of our high calling.

We are grateful that in our land the individual need never lose his halo; here through our fellowship we may give service that will rescue from want, woe, and fear. The world is too big in which to be small, too lovely in which to be unlovely, and Thou art too great a friend for us to be friendless. Dear Lord, across the waters the gods of war are raging and pouring out their curses and bitterness upon generations unborn. May nothing scar our obligations to the enslaved peoples, the victims of lust for power that withers whatever it touches. O Lord, give us wisdom for the problems of the hour as we meet the responsibilities of service, and may our citizens of every walk and rank heed the call and commit themselves as loyal stewards of our Government. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 6, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 6):

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Those Members-elect present who have not taken the oath of office will appear at the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Thereupon Mr. BARDEN, Mr. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CHENOWETH took the oath of office.

FRANK W. COLLIER

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, it was a beautiful, sunny, and an auspicious day exactly 37 years ago today that one of the most trusted employees of the House of Representatives arrived in the city of Washington to become a messenger in the House post office. I refer to my friend of many years' standing, Mr. Frank W. Collier, one of the minority clerks of this House.

I first became acquainted with Mr. Collier when he was proprietor of a pharmacy in the city of La Crosse, Wis., my home city. In my daily rounds as a newsboy, I used to drop in Frank's store to get warm on cold winter days when the mercury dropped to 30 and 40 below zero, as it so often does in Wisconsin.

I missed Frank Collier when he left La Crosse for that big city in the East, the Capital of our country. But we in the home town kept close watch of Frank's progress in Washington, and we were very happy to learn 2 years after he left us that he had been promoted to chief page of the House of Representatives. To us back home in Wisconsin that was proof that our fellow townsman was rising in his new work and was recognized as a leader in the Nation's Legislative Halls.

And then when Frank was appointed to the position of postmaster of the House of Representatives in 1921 his friends in La Crosse knew that he had arrived. Mr. Collier held that position of honor and trust and respect until in 1933, when the Republican Party became the minority party. Since that time Frank Collier has been with us here as a minority clerk of the House. Frank has won the good will and respect of all the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. Whenever any of us, whether members of the majority or minority party, wants any information, a document, extra copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or if there is any favor we desire, we have found Frank Collier here in the House always ready to serve us graciously and with a smile.

I extend to Frank Collier my sincere congratulations on this his thirty-seventh anniversary as a trusted employee of the House of Representatives. He has been connected with the House of Representatives longer than any present Member of Congress. I wish him continued good health and happiness and hope he will be with the House for many more years of trusted service. Frank Collier, I salute you.

HOUSING FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement which will be of interest to all Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say especially to the new Members of

the Seventy-ninth Congress that in December the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and myself received certain inquiries and some complaints from Members of the House relative to suitable living quarters during their tenure in office in the present Seventy-ninth Congress. As chairman of the House District Committee, I at that time called representatives of the War Housing Center, the Washington Hotel Association, and others for a conference. It was decided that we would have the officials of the War Housing Center address a letter to each new Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Eighty-eight communications were sent to those Members and 30 replies were received. Until last week, 10 of those 30 have been placed in apartments or houses. The Speaker of the House is interested in this matter. Unofficially, I am acting for the District Committee in helping any of those Members who still are in difficulty. For this reason we have called an informal meeting of the committee this afternoon at 3 o'clock in room 345 of the Old House Office Building. I trust the new Members, and those old Members who have some particular housing problem that we might assist, will be at the appointed place.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the gentleman has taken the floor to explain this situation to the new Members. This also applies to many of the old Members who have been unable to obtain suitable quarters. It will be recalled that, 5 years ago, I introduced a resolution in the House asking for an appropriation to build an apartment building for Members and their employees so that they might have the opportunity of obtaining suitable quarters at a fair and reasonable price and not be held up and robbed. I have reintroduced that resolution in the present session, and I would like to know whether the gentleman does not think that prompt action should be taken in order to take care of many of the Members who are being held up by the hotels and owners of apartment buildings. Some even now have not suitable quarters. They are obliged to live in Virginia, Maryland, and other places at this time. Does not the gentleman believe that matter should be given some consideration?

BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 6, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052a), I have designated Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON, Hon. JOHN H. KERR, Hon. D. LANE POWERS, and Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL, members of the Committee on Appropriations, as members from this committee to the Board

of Visitors of the United States Military Academy for the Seventy-ninth Congress.

With assurances of my regard, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of public law, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission to Consider a Site and Design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia the following Members of the House: Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. LANHAM, and Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois.

CONFIDENTIAL MEETING OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND GENERAL OF THE ARMY GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL OF THE FLEET ERNEST J. KING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, acting with the approval of the President, are planning to invite the Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress to a confidential meeting at which General of the Army George C. Marshall and Admiral of the Fleet Ernest J. King will make an off-the-record report on the war.

The purpose of this meeting is to give the membership a factual background of the latest information on our fighting forces in all theaters of war.

It seems to me that this meeting will come at a particularly appropriate time. From now on this body will be faced with decisions of the gravest importance to our war effort. It will be invaluable to all of us to have first-hand facts from General Marshall and Admiral King.

As I have said, this will be an off-the-record meeting. The representatives of the Army and the Navy plan to tell us facts which, for security reasons, cannot be told publicly at this time. Because of the confidential nature of the meeting, only Members of Congress, in person, will be admitted. It will be impossible for us to take with us any member of our families or our staffs, or to delegate anyone to attend in our behalf.

I am deeply impressed by the importance of this meeting and the good which can result from it. I therefore urge every Member of the Senate and the House to arrange his time so that he may attend. Because of the confidential nature of the meeting, only Members of the Congress will be admitted, and no one else.

I might say that this meeting will take place sometime during the week of January 22. The exact date has not yet been decided but when it is, I will advise the membership of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I suggest to the majority leader that he invite them to hold that meeting in the Hall of the House of Representatives. It would be much more convenient to the majority of the Members than any place you could find downtown, and there would be a larger attendance.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will keep that suggestion in mind. I might also say that we had one such meeting, as I remember, in the last session. The Members of the House were invited, and every Member kept his word as to whatever was said off the record. I was proud of the fact that after that meeting no Member of the House violated the confidence—and I am speaking about the House in particular—and that there were no wild stories afterward of what actually was said or took place, because every Member respected and kept the confidence that was reposed in him.

IV-F'S

Mr. FOAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOAGE. Mr. Speaker, as the result of the President's very splendid suggestion that we implement the method of securing the cooperation of all sections of our population in the war effort, there has been some disposition on the part of individuals and publications alike to disparage the present position of the IV-F's. I think it is only fair that we call attention to the fact that those men who are suffering from physical handicaps which have made it impossible for them to serve in the armed forces at this time are not deferred because of their own wishes but because of the regulations of the Army, and they should not be looked upon in any way as being slackers or unpatriotic. It is not their fault that they are in that position. It is too bad that the Army has not heretofore seen fit to provide a practical method of using their services.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman may remember that the Committee on Military Affairs as early as last March recommended a relaxation of those physical requirements by the War Department.

Mr. FOAGE. That is correct. I think the committee was right. I have no criticism of anyone except to call attention to the fact that those men who have sometimes been unthoughtfully criticized are in that position through no choice of their own, and we should not look upon them as unpatriotic or unwilling to fight for their country. You cannot join Uncle Sam's Army unless the Army will take you. In the past the Army has refused to take these men. I am glad it now wants them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Dies committee died, but it was immediately resurrected as a standing committee of the House under new leadership. The English expression that covers this phenomenon is, "The King is dead! Long live the King!" I had expected to conduct a post mortem, or autopsy, over the dead body, but obviously that is impossible now. As a member of the Dies committee during most of its turbulent career, I wish to make the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, a proper evaluation of the accomplishments of this committee can only be made by a careful analysis of the work that the committee has done—entirely aside from the sensational and somewhat spectacular publicity given to the hearings of the committee during its turbulent career, most of which centered around its colorful chairman. The cold hard facts are as follows:

(a) The committee has accumulated in its files the most valuable reservoir of information on subversive activities that exists in the Nation today.

(b) This reservoir of information in itself is worth all the money spent by the committee during its 7 years.

(c) Since December 7, 1941, the F. B. I., the Naval Intelligence, the Military Intelligence, the Secret Service, and other branches of the Government have been using the files of the Dies committee almost daily to secure evidence upon which many convictions have been secured.

(d) The action of the House in establishing a Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities as one of the standing committees of the House makes certain that the valuable files of the Dies committee will be preserved, and also makes certain that they will continue to be available to any department of the Government that may need the information contained therein.

Mr. Speaker, because an article written by David Lawrence, entitled "Dies Group Revival Laid to P. A. C. Itself," gives a true picture of the reason for the action of the House, and, in my opinion, justifies that action, I include the article as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 5, 1945]

DIES GROUP REVIVAL LAID TO P. A. C. ITSELF—LEFT-WINGERS FAILED TO REALIZE OPPOSITION STRENGTH, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

The revival of the so-called Dies committee, which comes as a surprise to the left-wingers, ought not to be a surprise at all, for they are the ones who are responsible for it.

The Dies committee, which has been investigating un-American activities, would never have been renewed, nor would such a decisive margin been cast for making the committee permanent in the House of Representatives, if it had not been for the extreme tactics of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. in the last year. It is an excellent example of how extremists, sometimes even with the best of intentions, overreach themselves.

For several years now the left-wingers have been attacking the Dies committee either by ridicule or with words of vitriolic condemnation. But these attacks have only served to make more and more suspicious those elements in the House of Representatives which are truly fearful that certain left-wing tendencies in this country and communism are so close together as to constitute a real menace to the future of American institutions.

Actually the amount of subversive activity in America is probably no greater today than 10 years ago, and maybe there are lots of people today who see things under the bed which are not really there. The greatest impetus, however, to the fear that communistic philosophies might be applied to undermine constitutional government in America came from the amazing tactics of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. in the last campaign.

GOMPERS' ADVICE IGNORED

These ignored entirely the advice which the late Samuel Gompers and other leaders of the American Federation of Labor have long tendered to the workers of America, namely, that they should not make themselves an instrument of either political party, but support or oppose candidates of both parties on their merits.

During the last year the C. I. O.-P. A. C. concentrated almost entirely on Republicans, and also on those Democrats in the South who had had the temerity to oppose some of the left-wing concepts. Thus Representative Dies, chairman of the committee, did not seek reelection, and Representatives Starnes, of Alabama, and Costello, of California, were defeated in Democratic Party primaries through the concentration of effort by the C. I. O.-P. A. C. in those three districts.

But the C. I. O.-P. A. C. made the mistake of thinking that the Dies committee consisted of just a few individuals. It failed to realize that back of the Dies committee was very powerful support, which could at almost any time command majorities in the House of Representatives.

An examination of the various votes taken either to authorize funds or to continue the Dies committee during the last 4 years reveals that the committee was in every case upheld by an overwhelming majority. The opposition in votes was always surprisingly small.

TRUE REASON FOR STRENGTH

What is the true reason for the strength of the Dies committee or its successor, which has now been made a permanent part of the committee structure of the House of Representatives? The truth is, as everybody who understands Washington politics realizes, that the forces behind the coalition in the House of Representatives derive their strength from the American Legion, the American Federation of Labor, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other patriotic societies, and a not inconsiderable element in the Catholic church whose opposi-

tion to communism or anything that even remotely suggests it is very well known.

The American Federation of Labor has always fought communism, and when the C. I. O.-P. A. C. movement started and critics said that in that movement were a number of Communists, the American Federation of Labor stood apart, and many of the leaders of A. F. L. and some of the railroad brotherhood unions predicted that what the C. I. O.-P. A. C. had done in the 1944 political campaign would rise to plague that organization for many years to come.

Again and again the C. I. O.-P. A. C. has thought it had the Dies committee movement beaten, but it did not realize perhaps that its own pressure to defeat it was largely responsible for the countersupport given to the committee this week by a vote of 207 to 186. Maybe if the left-wingers had let the Dies committee alone, it would have died a natural death long before this.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permission to address the House today for 25 minutes that was granted me last week be carried over to a later date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS BETWEEN THE AGES OF 18 AND 26

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, press reports on the announcement of War Mobilization Director Byrnes as to the induction of agricultural workers between the ages of 18 and 26 have caused great consternation in my district, and particularly among the dairy interests.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to append to my remarks the contents of a letter on the subject from the Dairymen's League Co-Operative Association, Inc., 11 West Forty-second Street, New York, addressed to Hon. Marvin Jones, Administrator, War Food Administration, and to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE
CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., January 5, 1945.
HON. MARVIN JONES,
Administrator, War Food
Administration, Washington, D. C.
MAJ. GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director of Selective Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: Press reports on Director Byrnes' order on the drafting of farm labor indicates that all farm men between the ages of 18 and 26 will be inducted by local draft boards.

It is my understanding that these newspaper headlines do not correctly portray the intent of the order. Its purpose, as I understand it, is to cause local draft boards to review the classification of farm men in this age class to screen out only those who are not vital to food production.

There is grave danger that under the urgency of manpower needs for the armed forces some local draft boards will fail to heed the provisions of the Tydings amendment and will induct farm workers who are vital to the production of critical foods, such as milk and dairy products.

The winning of the war is of first concern to all of us. To do this in the shortest time possible we must continue to maintain an adequate food supply, particularly such nutritious and vital foods as milk and dairy products.

The War Food Administration and Selective Service have indicated that they are deeply concerned regarding the maintenance of production of milk and dairy products. Despite Herculean efforts on the part of dairy farmers, milk production during the years 1940 to 1944 has fallen far short of demand. As you know, the storage of butter, cheese, and evaporated milk is at a dangerously low level. Production of milk and dairy products during these critical years since the war began, in spite of night and day efforts of dairymen, has lagged behind the production of most other agricultural commodities, as the following table clearly indicates:

Percent of increase for 1944 over 1935-39 average	
Product:	
Oil crops.....	236
Food grains.....	53
Feed grains (including hay).....	30
Truck crops.....	39
Meat animals (including poultry and poultry products).....	50
Dairy production.....	13

The failure of dairy production to keep pace with that of other agricultural products has been due in part to the fact that encouragement to increase milk production was withheld to a greater extent and for a longer period than for other agricultural products. Price relationships and the exacting labor requirements for production of milk account for the lag, as compared with production of meat, poultry, and most crops.

The smallest farm labor force of record has produced during 1944 the largest volume of agricultural products in our history—33 percent more than the 1935-39 prewar volume. Yet, the production of milk and dairy products is still far below requirements.

Interpretation along the lines indicated by the headlines of newspapers by local draft boards of Director Byrnes' order will further deplete the scanty supply of skilled young men working on family size farms. I understand that the age of the average farm operator in this State is 59 years. During September their average work day was 12.6 hours, while industrial employees in this State and the Nation averaged to work less than 7.5 hours per day. The operation of dairy farms calls for continuous work—a 7-day week—a 365-day job. No doubt the hours worked on family-size dairy farms are well above the average of all farms of the State. Efforts of the Government to alleviate the farm-labor situation by the use of temporary or migratory labor are commendable and have been of much assistance to certain types of agriculture. Production of milk and milk products, however, does not lend itself to the use of mass or seasonal labor or labor imported from Jamaica, Mexico, or prisoners of war, or migratory workers. Milk production requires skilled year-round workers.

Unless local draft boards give full consideration to the Tydings amendment in its relation to needed dairy production and unless they continue to defer skilled, willing, productive farm workers who cannot be replaced, many herds in this milkshed will have to be disposed of and many farms will have to lie idle. This would result in a disservice and

would tend to prolong the war and delay victory.

Very sincerely,

FRED H. SEXAUER,
President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article by William P. Kennedy that he has prepared for the Minnesota State Historical Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

POINTS AND CHARTERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago today, while the Nation was at war, Woodrow Wilson stood before this body and sketched his famous Fourteen Points as a foundation for world peace. About 9 months later, these were supplemented by the Five Points which he presented at a meeting in New York. These are interesting not only as part of the history of a troubled period in our national life but as comparative literature as we contemplate the anxiety and concern which today dwells in the common heart over the status of the Atlantic Charter and the broad principles which it sets forth. On this anniversary occasion, it would appear appropriate to refresh ourselves on the provisions in the Fourteen Points, the Five Points, and the Atlantic Charter, and I ask unanimous consent that they be incorporated as a part of these brief observations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The matters referred to are as follows:

THE 14 POINTS

(From President Wilson's address to Congress, January 8, 1918)

The program of the world's peace, therefore, is our program, and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace, and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guaranties given and taken that the national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims,

based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined.

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly 50 years, should be righted in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontier of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated, occupied territories restored, Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea, and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along their topographically established lines of allegiance and nationality, and international guaranties of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guaranties.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of according mutual guaranties of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

THE FIVE POINTS

(From President Wilson's address at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, September 27, 1918)

1. The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favorites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

2. No special or separate interests of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

3. There can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

4. And more specifically—there can be no special selfish economic combinations within the League and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

5. All international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world.

TEXT OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Fourth. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Fifth. They desire to bring about the full collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Eighth. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will

lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

UNFAIR PUBLIC COMPETITION

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members of the House to a very interesting editorial which appears in a publication called the Union, a labor publication of northwestern Pennsylvania. The editorial is entitled "Unfair Public Competition." It calls to our attention that in the State of Oklahoma they have an unusual and extreme case of the investor-owned Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., which has a tax bill of 4.588 mills per kilowatt hour, being compelled to compete with a tax-free Government project which sells electric power at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. If the public plant were taxed, it would have to sell its power at 8.588 mills per kilowatt-hour. In other words, the total gross rate of the Government power project is not even enough to pay the taxes levied against its competitor, the privately owned company. Now I ask how long can private enterprise compete against a situation of this kind? Certainly an unfair situation as this must be corrected if private enterprise is to exist.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial to which I refer is as follows:

UNFAIR PUBLIC COMPETITION

Uncle Sam's taxing power has become something of enormous importance. He now requires huge revenues with which to carry on the wars against Germany and Japan; and in the post-war era and for many long years afterward, he will need huge revenues to meet the interest on the war debt, to begin to pay off part of that indebtedness, to take care of our returning soldiers, and to carry on the ordinary business of his Government.

Therefore, anything that interferes with the right of the Federal Government, the 48 individual States, and the municipalities of the Nation to tax any business, must be removed. For example, the whole theory that Government projects should be exempt from all kinds of taxation is wrong. Only the true business of Government, that is, the carrying on of the actual government of Nation, State, or municipality, should be exempt from taxation. Such exemption should not be applied to any property or activity of Government when it is engaged in the business of producing goods or services for sale. When Government does this, it should be on exactly the same footing as any private enterprise engaged in similar activities.

When the Government activity is competitive and is bidding against private enterprise for the patronage of clients, it is an injustice that private enterprise should be taxed and the public enterprise go free; but even worse than that, it all too often so hamstrings private enterprise as to drive it eventually out of business, thus coddling public enterprise and depriving it of all incentive to efficiency.

For instance, and this is not an unusual or extreme case, the investor-owned Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. has a tax bill of 4.588 mills per kilowatt-hour. It is expected to compete with a tax-free Government

project which sells electric power at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. If the public plant was taxed, it would have to sell its power at 8.588 mills per kilowatt-hour. In other words, the total gross rate of the Government power project is not even enough to pay the taxes levied against its competitor, the privately owned company.

One does not have to be a certified public accountant or a mathematical wizard to see that unless this unfair situation is changed, the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. is doomed to close up shop, the only question being as to how long it will be able to continue in business in the face of such odds.

But even more serious than this unfairness to private investors is that at a time when governments need every dollar of revenue they can collect, the Federal Government sets itself up in various businesses, exempts them from taxation, and cuts off important sources of revenue.

We always have opposed Government going into business, either in competition with or to the exclusion of private enterprise. This country has had so many striking evidences of the superior efficiency of private enterprise, of its ability in many cases to meet unfair, untaxed Government competition, that we perpetually marvel that there is still one single American propagandizing to put the Government into business.

But, if we must have these Government projects, then every dictate of fairness decrees that they should operate under the same rules and regulations that govern private enterprise. And if one has no disposition to be fair, then purely selfish motives should demand taxation of Government businesses in order to provide the tax revenues so badly needed now and in the future.

This making sheep of Government enterprises and goats of private enterprises works an injustice not only to the stockholders of the privately owned companies, but also, in the final analysis, to the stockholders (the taxpayers) of Uncle Sam, Inc.

THE LATE MRS. RUTH HANNA SIMMS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on December 31 of last year, this Nation suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of Mrs. Ruth Hanna Simms in Billings Memorial Hospital in Chicago. Mrs. Simms was a former Member of this body, having served in the Seventy-first Congress as Congresswoman at large from the State of Illinois. Her surviving husband, Albert G. Simms, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., is also a former colleague, having represented the State of New Mexico in the same Congress.

On last Thursday, January 4, I attended the funeral services for Mrs. Simms which were held in Albuquerque. Mrs. Simms, while a legal resident of the State of New Mexico, had many interests in Colorado, and spent much of her time supervising a large cattle and sheep ranch located near Fort Garland in my district known as the Trinchera Ranch. She established the Fountain Valley School near Colorado Springs and was a director at the time of her death. This is one of the outstanding boys' schools of the country, and attracts students from many States.

Mr. Speaker, I consider Mrs. Simms one of the outstanding women of this age. She made a most valuable contribution to our social and political life. She gave most generously of her time and means to the advancement of those programs which she thought would make this country a better place in which to live. It was a high privilege for me to know her and to enjoy her friendship.

The eulogy to Mrs. Simms was delivered by Hon. Sam G. Bratton, of Albuquerque, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Judge Bratton is a former Member of the United States Senate, having resigned from that body to accept appointment to the bench. Judge Bratton, as a friend and neighbor of Mrs. Simms, had the opportunity to appraise her qualities, work, and influence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the eloquent tribute to Mrs. Simms delivered by the Honorable Sam G. Bratton at her funeral service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EULOGY TO MRS. RUTH HANNA SIMMS
(By Sam G. Bratton)

The ages are replete with vainglorious funerals, marble arches, towering, silent pyramids, and even attempts at defilection, but surpassing all of these have been the words of living survivors, embedded in the treasure houses of recorded history, eternally fresh and pregnant with life, encouragement, and hope for the future. If the scientists and philosophers are correct in telling us that no form of life or energy fails to register itself, that the pebble dropped in the placid pool spreads in a symmetrical circle to expansions of unknown ends; and that the fragrance of the modest violet pervades the universe, surely a life of unremitting toil attended by courage, charity, gentleness, and kindness must continue through the channels of remembrance to blossom and bear fruit again in the thoughts and acts of the oncoming generations. The darkness of the valley of the shadow of death surrounds us and obscures our vision, but we unite in the firm belief that the sweetness and gentleness of nature, the charm of personality, the kindness of manner, the readiness of sympathy, and the unbounded love for husband and children, always present in the life of Mrs. Simms, will find attunement in the life of others, even those who come after her.

Mrs. Simms acquired an academic and classical education in private schools in New York and Connecticut. She bore the unparalleled distinction of being the daughter of a United States Senator from Ohio, the wife of a United States Senator from Illinois, a member, herself, of the House of Representatives from Illinois, and later the wife of our own fellow citizen who had served in the House of Representatives from New Mexico. For many years she occupied a commanding position in the national councils of her political party, and she always was an active figure in the political councils of the State of her residence. Her objectives in politics were to maintain the best traditions of her party and the highest levels of public service. It was her consistent philosophy that the more weighty the issue, the more serious the debate; the wider the margin for honest and scientific research, the greater the opportunity for public service. Her life was one of devotion to American ideals. She was a painstaking student of her country's history, and she was thoroughly familiar with the origin of our Government and the foundation principles on which it rests. To her,

our essential liberties were a heritage which should be defended at all costs. Her horizon took in all the circumstances and needs of the country with remarkable understanding. She had a rare insight into our social problems, and in her quest for their solution she sought to make an intelligent adaptation to the needs of her time. Throughout her life, and more particularly in recent years, she was deeply interested in an effort to maintain peace among the nations, and it is safe to say that if her life had been spared longer she would have rendered conspicuous service in our effort toward the establishment of a world order in which controversies among nations will be settled by means other than resort to war.

Mrs. Simms was deeply interested in industrial and civic matters. She was active in the Women's Trade Union League, business and professional women's clubs, and other like concerts of action; and she was among the pioneers in the long and successful struggle for legislation affecting child labor. She was publisher of a paper in Illinois, operated a large cattle ranch in Colorado, and, together with her husband, established Los Poblanos, one of the outstanding stock farms of the Southwest. More than anyone else, she sponsored the Little Theater in Albuquerque and the June music festival. And she was wholeheartedly interested in education. She established and maintained the Fountain Valley School in Colorado and the Sandia School and the Manzano Day School in Albuquerque. In addition, she devoted much of her interest to the field of art. Los Poblanos Gallery was widely known and brought deep enjoyment to many lovers of art. Unpublished and almost secretive, her benefactions to mankind were varied and innumerable; and she unflinchingly responded in generous measure to every need of community life.

Though her achievements were many in number and magnificent in kind, the personal qualities of her life rose transcendently above them. Modesty, simplicity, and unobtrusiveness were keynotes in her daily life. She was sensitive and retiring, but her strong personality made her a compelling influence in any company or concert of action. And to her the breath of sustained friendship was as incense, sweetening, inspiring, and strengthening her life. But, along with her gentleness of manner, she had an incisiveness of perception, an integrity of mind, a fixedness of purpose, and a courage of steel which knew not how to yield in the unflinching pursuit of truth. She permitted nothing to weaken the influence or tarnish the luster of truth in the edifice of life, and she never wavered in her unflinching support of an ideal.

The search for the source of these qualities in the life of our departed friend is not difficult. It was faith. It was her steadfast faith in the power of good to triumph over evil; her abiding faith in the capacity of her fellow man for self-government; her deep faith in the perpetuity of our institutional arrangements; her gripping faith in the efficiency and adequacy of constitutional government to safeguard the rights and liberties of men in all walks of life; her unbounded faith in the brotherhood of man; and her unshakable faith in God. These were the qualities which dominated her life and welded together her faculties into a harmonious whole. These were the attributes which attuned her life with a resonant melody of hope and charity. These were the constituent elements which directed her unswerving path until the tender voice of Divine Providence summoned her from labor to rest, from solicitude to peace, summoned her to a well-earned and exceeding reward.

The death of Mrs. Simms was a tremendous shock. The city, the State, and the Nation suffered an irreparable loss. Those engaged in the fields of industry, education, culture, and social advancement lost a gallant helper and benefactor. The surviving husband lost

a devoted life companion, the daughters lost a fountain of love, other relatives lost one whose place cannot be filled, and we lost a friend. As best we can, we share with them a sense of emptiness, and we extend to them sympathy. Steeped in loss, but enriched by the friendship and nobility of character of a gracious lady who came our way, we think we can hear the echo of her voice repeating softly the words of Tennyson:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea.
For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to meet my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the tribute to a former member of this body, the late Ruth Hanna McCormick Simms, which has been presented by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], expresses better than words of mine can do the great respect in which this distinguished lady was held by the citizens of my State.

Mrs. Simms has been brought home to New Mexico to find there a final resting place. She will lie there surrounded by many testimonials to her generosity toward the community and to her capacity as a builder, particularly in educational lines.

Near at hand in Colorado is the Fountain Valley School for Boys which she built into a fine institution. In Albuquerque is the Manzano School; and when the war is over we hope there will again be the Sandia School for Girls, which became in a period of a few years one of the Southwest's outstanding educational institutions.

In the development of the farm near Albuquerque, she was of tremendous assistance and inspiration to her husband, also a former Member of this House, the Honorable Albert G. Simms. Into that property, known as the Los Poblanos ranch, went their plans and their dreams for the agricultural development of the Middle Rio Grande Valley. Part of the ranch home was devoted to the housing of the Los Poblanos Art Gallery, which already has proved of value to the artists in the Southwest.

Without regard to our party affiliations, all citizens of New Mexico recognized in Mrs. Simms an outstanding citizen who was willing to give of her time and her money for the development and future welfare of our State. Her passing will be a tremendous loss to my home community and to my State, and I join with the gentleman from Colorado in paying tribute to her many accomplishments.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced House Joint Resolution 16, including a proposed amendment to the Constitution em-

powering the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties provided a majority of the Members in each House concur.

Changing the present antiquated method of treaty ratification is one of the most important issues before the Congress. Late in the last session the Committee on the Judiciary, after extensive hearings, reported favorably a resolution similar to the one I introduced on the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Committee action came so late in the Seventy-eighth Congress that a rule for the consideration of the measure on the floor could not be obtained. I hope that the Judiciary Committee will act immediately upon this question; that the Rules Committee will allow the issue to reach the floor at the earliest opportunity; and that the House will vote to present the amendment to the State legislatures.

Time is a most vital factor. Over 40 of the State legislatures are meeting this year. If the Congress acts promptly the proposed amendment striking from the Constitution the obstructive two-thirds rule can become operative within a few months. It is the duty of Congress to give the State legislatures an opportunity to act on the proposed amendment while they are in session this year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement I made on January 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LIVING QUARTERS FOR MEMBERS OF REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is generally well known that I speak here quite often on behalf of minorities. I believe I belong to the largest minority in the country—the Republican Party. In good faith, and in all good humor, I wish everybody had been so concerned about seating and finding living quarters for the new Republicans who came in 2 years ago as they are concerned about seating the new boys who are coming in now, when so many of them are from the majority party. So, in the future, just remember, if the minority attains such proportions as to almost become the majority, we have to live and eat and sleep just like anyone else.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the country, as well as the Congress, was gratified to see the President in his message emphasize the seriousness of this war and take cognizance of seriousness of the manpower situation. For several weeks I have been working on a bill which I have today introduced, and which I think would go a long way toward meeting the problem.

Briefly, the bill would set up another branch of the military forces to be known as the supply forces. All persons subject to the provisions of selective service, who are in a deferred status, would automatically be included in a pool known as the supply forces and be placed on inactive status subject to the call of the President as Commander in Chief to render such service as is considered essential to the war effort. When the services of such a person so deferred were needed for the war effort, he would be called from inactive status to active status in the supply forces. The provisions of the bill would apply to, first, those persons presently deferred because of physical disability, the so-called IV-F's, who are not presently engaged in essential war work and who could pass a prescribed physical examination; second, those persons not engaged in an occupation essential to the war effort; third, those persons who are enjoying occupational deferment but who strike or leave their jobs; fourth, those persons who were engaged in a job essential to the war effort who acquired a record, after the passage of this bill, of willful absenteeism for which there was no reasonable justification, and, fifth, all other persons subject to the provisions of the selective service law not herein enumerated who are not specifically exempt by law.

The bill also provides that net profits on war contracts in excess of \$10,000 shall be limited to 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, time will not permit a full discussion of the bill. I do want to say, however, that the bill is not aimed at the so-called IV-F's—boys who have been deferred through no fault of their own but because of some physical disability. Neither is it aimed at any group or segment of our people but rather is an honest effort to completely mobilize the manpower of the Nation and to limit the profits of the war contractors. We have been hearing a great deal about the people of the country not appreciating the gravity of the war. Sometimes I wonder if the people are not ahead of the statesmen. I believe that the people of the country are ready and willing to see steps taken to fully mobilize the manpower of the country and give the boys on the fighting fronts the support to which they are so justly entitled. I realize full well that there are those who will oppose the provisions of this bill, but can we as Members of Congress who drafted these young men into service on the global battle fronts deny them the necessary ships, planes, ammunition, guns, and other sinews of warfare necessary to bring this war to a victorious conclusion and to stop

at the earliest moment the slaughter upon the battle fronts of the world? As a matter of fact, you and I know that these young people whom we have called into the armed service of the country and their bereaved loved ones are the only segments of our people who have made any real sacrifices in this war effort. As a matter of fact, the average American citizen is now more prosperous than ever before. We are in two tragic wars of serious implications and of what promises to be long duration. We must become realistic if we would hasten an early and victorious end to these wars.

I hope we may have early hearings and consideration of this bill by the Committee on Military Affairs. Time is of the essence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Washington Star on the President's annual message on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a press release from the Maritime Commission showing ship construction for the years 1936 through 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE FARMERS AND THE DRAFT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much surprised that the War Mobilization Director's order of last Wednesday has not invoked a stronger protest from the agriculturalists of the country than it has. Perhaps the multitude of orders and directives recently coming from Mr. Byrnes' office has everyone a bit confused.

Nevertheless that directive ordering the induction of farm workers in the 18-26 age group seems to me to bear close investigation and consideration.

Only last Friday the President told his press conference that the shipping of food to Italy was soon to be materially stepped up with 15 to 29 more ships to be soon devoted to this purpose. And food for Italy, of course, is only a drop in the bucket to the needs of our armed forces and the conquered countries and peoples we are feeding and will have to continue to feed.

I understand that the production of food in Europe and Australia, whence a very large proportion of the subsistence supplies for the United States armed forces have come, is expected to be materially reduced due to severe floods in

Europe—the worst in 100 years, and severe droughts in Australia. Wheat production in Australia is expected to be less than half of last year's crop, which is necessitating the slaughter of large numbers of sheep because of the shortage of fodder.

Now with no less an authority than Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, stating, as he did in an address in New York the 2d of the month, that the food outlook for 1945 "is on the lean side" with "less meat, butter, sugar, and certain processed foods" available; I think it is an ill-timed occasion to disrupt and disturb the American farmer who has been producing so well. Even if not one single farm hand is taken, the fact that the statement has been made that they are going to be taken will, I think, have the effect of seriously retarding and delaying the planting of much-needed crops, because no farmer is going to plant something that he might not have the help to harvest. It seems inconsistent to me that the whisky-distilling industry should be given a holiday from the production of war alcohol thereby diverting manpower, materials, and transportation facilities and thereby using up our grain stocks, and at the same time, by this recent directive, embarking on a program which can only further materially lessen those food stock piles.

As long as we are determined to be the bread basket of the world, we should protect the source of our supply. The return to rationing of so many food items would suggest to the average layman that more and not less food was in order. If manpower is as seriously needed as Mr. Byrnes seems to think it is, I would suggest combing the gambling and liquor industries and the many hotel, restaurant, and bar employees, most of whom are able-bodied young men, for additional manpower, and leave the farmers and livestock producers alone. A warring and working nation needs food.

We cannot spare, in my section of the country, any farm help from production of farm and livestock commodities. Our help in that regard has been drained white. Many farms and livestock ranches are today being operated and the work done by aged men and women, young children and girls. The aged persons are too old to continue this work. Many farms will go idle and production will be decreased if there is any further call for farm help for industrial or Army or Navy help. The condition on the farms is more serious than anyone could imagine unless they have first-hand information. Personally, I own and operate a ranch and small farm, and I have personal knowledge of the situation I am talking about, as well as having seen this condition herein outlined all over my district.

APPROPRIATE SUGGESTION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following column appeared in the Shawano (Wis.) County Journal of January 4, 1944. In reading the many county weekly and daily papers of my district I find many, many words of wisdom that could be and should be taken to heart by every citizen.

The editor of the Shawano County Journal is Mr. Harold Meyer. Mr. Meyer is chairman of the Shawano County Republican Club. He is one of the most active, and, I might also say, one of the most militant county Republican chairmen in our State during campaign time.

The column reads as follows:

JUST-A-MINUTE
(D. C. H.)

We have met one or two, and we have mail from one or two more, of our New Deal friends, who seem to be considerably bothered because we have not taken a shot at their party's policies in recent issues of this column.

The explanation is simple: When the populace had voted, we, being American, proposed to abide by the decision of the majority. The New Dealers didn't elect their President; they elected our President, and until the war is over we propose to lend our efforts toward its winning.

We realize that our scope of influence is extremely narrow, yet we wouldn't want to think that even one person had reduced his efforts toward winning the war one iota because of anything we had written in this column.

So, for the duration, we aren't Republican, nor are we New Deal; we're just one of millions of Americans doing his unified bit to end the war and bring the boys back home.

Until those ends are attained, nothing else matters.

Although this county was carried by a large majority by Governor Dewey, this comment indicates the sentiment of all the thinking people of our district. It is a privilege and an honor to serve a constituency that puts first things first. The people do not want bickering—they do not want to tolerate programs that are based on political expediency, sectional or class favoritism, nor do they want "quickie" advancement in the military itself. They want unity and unity of purpose to accomplish the task ahead. Every bill brought before this House should be subjected to one analysis on its first appraisal and that is, Will this legislation help or retard the winning of the war?

Our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, is entitled to the unity he asked for the opening day of our session. The administration forces, however, must accept the responsibility of proposing and passing legislation that will create and maintain this unity of purpose.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an article on Alaska and Governor Gruening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reply to the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the 4th of January, entitled "No Partisan Politics," and the privilege of showing him the difference between partisan politics and constructive criticism. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the conclusion of other special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF FARM BOYS INTO THE MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, over the week end I visited my district in southeastern Pennsylvania and personally contacted several hundred people. I find them very much alarmed and excited over the fact that deferred farm boys are going to be called into the military service. Not only are the farmers disturbed and annoyed but the people generally, realizing there is a pending food shortage, look forward to food rationing far beyond anything yet experienced here.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to address the House in reference to this matter in greater detail in a very short time. This is a very serious situation that should be given more consideration. Food is all important. Had we met our commitments in liberated countries, maybe the British soldiers would not now have to be fighting the Greeks.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD

and to include therein an item on the strength of the Nation.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a very fine editorial from the New York Herald Tribune regarding the late Mrs. Simms, a great American and a former able colleague in this House.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE BETWEEN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND GENERAL MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL KING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that at last my request that General Marshall and Admiral King come before the Congress to give us the facts regarding the conduct of the war has been granted. There may be some things that the country at large cannot be told at the moment on account of military reasons. However, I wish that meeting could be divided into two parts and that one-half of it might be attended by the press to hear what is said. America should be told the truth.

I know that the country as a whole does not realize what we face on our far-flung battle fronts. It is incredible that there should be a shortage of nurses at this time, some 29,000, if the 9,000 is counted which the Veterans Administration urgently needs for nursing care of our disabled of all wars. We cannot let the men that we send to fight for us die on account of lack of care. The same thing applies to industry. We cannot allow production to be curtailed on account of a lack of workers.

Mr. Speaker, if the people would be told the truth in this country, we would not have shortages in the war effort anywhere. It is quite obvious that the Germans for some time have known very much more about our affairs than we have ourselves.

The SPEAKER: The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders which may have heretofore been entered I may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow or at the next meeting of the House, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER: Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

Baldwin, Md.	Corbett	Hall,
Baldwin, N. Y.	Courtney	Edwin Arthur
Barrett, Pa.	Crawford	Hall,
Barry	Curley	Leonard W.
Bates, Mass.	Delaney,	Harless, Ariz.
Beall	James J.	Harness, Ind.
Bell	Dickstein	Hays
Bender	Dingell	Heffernan
Bennet, N. Y.	Dolliver	Heidinger
Bloom	Doughton, N. C.	Hoeven
Bolton	Drewry	Jackson
Bradley, Mich.	Durham	Jensen
Bradley, Pa.	Earlham	Johnson,
Brumbaugh	Eberharter	Lyndon B.
Buckley	Elasesser	Judd
Bulwinkle	Fellows	Kearney
Byrne, N. Y.	Fogarty	Kefauver
Campbell	Fuller	Kelley, Pa.
Case, N. J.	Fulton	Keogh
Case, S. Dak.	Gamble	Kilburn
Celler	Gardner	Kilday
Chapman	Gerlach	Kirwan
Clark	Gillie	Kunkel
Coffee	Gore	Latham
Cole, N. Y.	Granahan	Lesinski
Cooley	Green	Luce

Lynch	Price, Fla.	Smith, Va.
McGehee	Quinn, N. Y.	Somers, N. Y.
McGlinchey	Rabin	Spence
Marcantonio	Ramey	Stefan
Morgan	Rayfield	Taylor
Murphy	Reece, Tenn.	Tibbott
Neely	Rees, Kans.	Torrens
Norton	Roe, Md.	Towe
O'Konski	Roe, N. Y.	Trimble
O'Toole	Rooney	Weichel
Outland	Rowan	Weiss
Peterson, Fla.	Sadowski	Wigglesworth
Pfeifer	Satterfield	Wilson
Philbin	Shafer	Winter
Plumley	Sheridan	Wolcott
Powell	Short	
Powers	Sikes	

The SPEAKER: On this roll call 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY and Mr. CELLER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter written to Judge Vinson.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a broadcast by Cedric Foster.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will state the grounds on which he claims the floor on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the Congress, as is well known, I offered an amendment to the rules to create a permanent Committee on Un-American Activities. That amendment was adopted by vote of the House.

This morning there appears in the Washington Post, a locally published newspaper, a statement reading as follows:

Lawyers Guild assails RANKIN as "anti-unity."

That is the headline.

The body of the article reads in part as follows:

The National Lawyers Guild last night urged the House to thwart the disruptive plan of Representative JOHN RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi) to perpetuate the Dies committee by appointing to the new Committee on Un-American Activities bipartisan Members of unimpeachable devotion to the war effort.

Martin Popper—

To whom I shall refer in a moment—the organization's executive secretary, said in a letter to all members of the Ways and Means Committee that RANKIN has "long disgraced himself by an anti-United Nations,

anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, anti-labor, and other anti-unity activities."

An article appearing in other papers quotes this same Popper as saying that "RANKIN is one of the most dangerous men in the United States."

I submit, without further quotation, Mr. Speaker, that those defamatory remarks violate the Rules of the House and entitle me to answer them on a question of personal privilege.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair believes that the gentleman from Mississippi has stated a question that involves the privileges of the House, it being an attack on his integrity as a Member of the House.

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a great American once said:

A farmer stuck a pitchfork into a hay bin. One prong of the fork went through a rat. The rat squealed.

I have no apologies for my activities in helping to perpetuate the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is one of my greatest services to my country.

This letter, by the way, was written by this man Popper to the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House in order to try to induce them to stack the Committee on Un-American Activities with Members they think are under the control or the influence of this organization, which is one of the most dangerous Communist fronts in the world.

Before I go further, let me show you who this man Popper is, and I will read from a speech delivered on March 9, 1944, on the floor of this House by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Martin Dies.

In that connection I want to say now that the name of Martin Dies will live in the history of this Republic long after these Communists have been driven to cover.

Martin Dies rendered a service to this Nation that few men in its history have surpassed, in bringing to light the subversive activities of these elements that are now grasping and trying to get control of the Congress of the United States, and insulting 100 or more of you Members by seeking to control you because they allegedly contributed to your campaign funds. The quicker those Members repudiate those claims the better it will be for them.

On that day Mr. Dies said:

First, let me deal with the Lawyers Guild so that I may dispose of it and let the House know the character of the men who have made this attack upon me and these other gentlemen of the House.

This same Popper was out attacking Mr. Dies then. Mr. Dies is not here to defend himself; but I want to serve notice on the House now that Mr. Dies has many friends in this House who believe in his patriotism and who are here ready to defend him against any attack, and your humble servant is one of them.

Continuing, Mr. Dies said:

From time to time we have exposed the Lawyers Guild as a Communist-dominated organization. When we first exposed the Lawyers Guild as controlled by the Communist Party, we were bitterly assailed, and yet immediately thereafter Robert Jackson, who was then Attorney General, now upon

the Supreme Court, withdrew his membership from the organization because, as he said, it was clearly controlled by Communists and he would have nothing to do with it.

That was during the time that Robert Jackson was Attorney General of the United States. He is now on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Dies continued:

Mr. Adolf Berle, an outstanding liberal, likewise withdrew his membership from the organization for the same reason. Judge Pecora also denounced the organization as Communist-controlled, and stated that he could no longer affiliate himself with it.

In that connection, I want to call the name of another man, one of the great liberal progressives of the State of New York, who has now passed away. I refer to my friend, Frank Walsh. Mr. Walsh took the chairmanship of the Lawyers Guild many years ago, and invited me to address them. At that time nobody had suspected that it was Communist-dominated, or would be. Later, when Mr. Walsh found out just what these gentlemen found out, he withdrew from the organization and repudiated it as Communist.

In this speech Mr. Dies goes on to say:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most conclusive proof of the nature of this organization which has so many representatives in key positions in this Government as I shall show in the course of my speech is for us to consider for a moment the national president of the organization and the national executive officer. Robert W. Kenny is national president of the guild. Martin Popper is national executive secretary. Surely these two men may properly be considered the ones who hold the key positions in the guild. Now, look at the facts. Martin Popper was a member of the seditious and potentially treasonable American Peace Mobilization group.

Does any man deny that that was a subversive organization? If so, let him rise now or forever hold his peace. Do not go in the cloakroom and denounce Martin Dies and JOHN RANKIN. You are going to do your talking on the floor of the House, if you do.

Let me repeat that sentence of Mr. Dies, that great courageous Texan who was abused and maligned, and whose wife and children these Communists threatened to murder:

Martin Popper was a member of the seditious and potentially treasonable American Peace Mobilization group.

This is the same Martin Popper who writes this letter to the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means and probably to the members of the Republican committee on committees, urging them not to pay any attention to me. What he wants them to do is to stack this committee with men of his own choosing.

Continuing, Mr. Dies said:

He was present as a delegate at the Chicago convention which launched the American Peace Mobilization movement.

Does anybody deny that that was a Communist front; a subversive front? If so, rise now and say so, or forever hold your peace.

Continuing, Mr. Dies said:

From the convention he sent a telegram to the President of the United States in

which he denounced the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill as "unconstitutional and as representing a violent upheaval in the social, political, and economic life of our country."

Think of that, at the time when Japan was plotting the Pearl Harbor attack, at the time when war was raising its grim visage in the Atlantic, to send that kind of a message down here against a conscription bill, which a majority of the Members of Congress felt was necessary in order to protect this Nation in its perilous hour.

Further quoting Mr. Dies:

That telegram was obviously the voice of the Communist Party couched in the language which the party was speaking at the time. I do not need to say more at this time on the Communist affiliations of Martin Popper, although his Communist record is a much more extensive one.

Robert W. Kenney, national president of the Lawyers Guild, was a member of the national committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy. The seditious and potentially treasonable character of the American League was fully exposed by our committee many years ago.

Does any man in this House deny that that was a subversive group, a Communist-front organization designed to destroy our form of government? If so, rise and say so now, and if not, forever hold your peace.

The league's platform included the following plank. Said Mr. Dies:

To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transport of munitions in time of peace or war, and in time of war the transport of all other materials essential to the conduct of war through mass demonstrations, picketing, and strikes.

Does anybody doubt that that was subversive? Suppose that policy had been carried out. The embarrassment our brave boys are now experiencing on the western front because of the lack of munitions as a result of these sit-down strikes and other slow-downs in our munitions industries would be nothing as compared with the pitiable plight they would be in if Mr. Popper's outfit could have had their way.

My recollection is that this same outfit was picketing the White House before Russia got into the war, at a time when our distinguished colleague from Alabama [MR. PATRICK] was ridiculing them by peeling potatoes in their presence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the crowd which writes this letter denouncing me. That is the same Popper.

There are a few columnists who have gone out of their way to criticize me; but the press, as a rule, has been decent to me in this matter. The passage of my amendment hit a responsive chord at the fireside of millions of American homes because they realize this danger. What will it profit us, if you please, for our boys to win the war abroad and then for Congress to sit here and let our country be destroyed at home? Among other attacks, one of them, speaking about me, says:

One of his heroes is David Crockett, the Tennessee frontiersman, from whom he claims collateral descendancy. Crockett, too, served in the House, but not for long. He fought the administration of his day and was in turn licked by it.

I think it is a pretty sad come-off, when 109 years after Colonel Crockett gave his life that Texas might be free, to have an article like that appear in the Washington Post in order to smear or discredit me. Colonel Crockett was my great grandmother's brother. Whatever fault he may have had he gave a glorious account of himself, and he has for 109 years been acclaimed as one of America's great heroes; until this smear bund takes a notion to go back and take a slap at him in order to slap me, because he disagreed with an administration at that time.

Here is another one. We have a little fellow here—I will not deign to mention his name—who jumps on my war record. In the first place, he says the Political Action Committee "gave \$1,500 to two candidates for running for RANKIN's seat," and he adds, "they might as well have poured the money down a rat hole."

Well, that is about what they did with a good deal of it. They poured more money than that into my district to try to defeat me in the primary, but failed ingloriously.

Now, if the time has come when Members of Congress have to be humiliated by having Sidney Hillman run around saying, "I have got my stamp on their back," then Congress might as well fold up. God bless you, he will never put that kind of stamp on me. But I will get to him in a moment.

This slimy little columnist goes further and does what other columnists have done in the past. He attacked my war record. Now, I have never claimed, and I do not now claim, credit for having won the First World War, although some of the members of my battery said when that question arose when we were being discharged, "The deuce we did not win it. Soon as the Kaiser heard that we were coming he threw up his hands and quit."

In the summer of 1918 this Government called for professional men who had had trigonometry. I do not pretend to be any mathematical genius, but I did pass an examination in trigonometry in college. I responded to that call. They said they needed 60,000 additional artillery officers to help blast the way to Berlin in the spring of 1919.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that I, too, answered that call because I had the mathematical foundation at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. I answered the call and was taken down with influenza. I got up from the flu one Wednesday and went to the Army the next. I joined the Field Artillery at Camp Taylor, Ky. I did not hunt a soft place and I did not find one. I did more work, more hard, honest labor during the first week that I was at Camp Taylor, Ky., than Sidney Hillman and Popper and this fellow Gaer, who calls himself "Gaer," whom I will refer to in a moment, who wrote this insulting book about the Congress called *The First Round*—I did more hard work the first week than they have done since they were run out of Russia.

We stayed there until the war closed. When the war closed they notified us we

would be discharged. But long before the war closed the battery met, at the request of one of the lieutenants, and elected officers. They elected me president of that battery without even consulting me about it. I have the names of those 206 men in my files. I will put them in the RECORD at a future date. A finer group of Americans never lived.

Just across the hill from me in another battery was a distinguished Member of this House who has now passed to the Great Beyond. I refer to the Honorable John Jacob Rogers, of Massachusetts, whose wife now represents the district he represented at that time. He and I talked about old Camp Taylor days many times. Another one who later came to Congress was Philip Swing, of California, and there are doubtless men here today, probably the gentleman from Illinois, who served in Camp Taylor. And yet every time this smear bund wants to lie about me they go back and lie about my war record. The War Department has never questioned it. If there was anything wrong with it they certainly would have let me know. I bring you this information in order to show you the kind of smear they used on Martin Dies and the kind of smear they are now using on me.

But I want to tell you that on this rock of Americanism I establish my political church, and, as the Bible says, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

I find here they are jumping on Republicans, saying I am leading the Republicans. All I have to say is that there has been a much worse group led a much longer distance than I ever led the Republicans. Besides, they said awhile ago that Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson were both Republicans. If that be true, probably I am getting in line with Jefferson and Jackson.

Remember, today is the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Jackson's great victory at New Orleans.

But the Philadelphia Record says this about you:

For a majority of Republicans to vote to reestablish this committee and to accept the leadership of Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, in doing so shows that they would much rather spend their afternoons playing back of the gas works than in the library.

You know who is editor of that paper? A man named Dave Stern. He has never lost an opportunity to smear me and to smear Martin Dies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer some of the charges. In this connection let me quote from what the commander of the American Legion said, according to an Associated Press report, on January 5 in Palm Springs, Calif. He said:

I am proud of the Seventy-ninth Congress for making the Dies committee a permanent organization.

The article says he said he had sent Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, a congratulatory message upon hearing the news. "The Legion has been actively behind the Dies committee since its inception," he said.

But this bunch tells you that I am dangerous. I admit, Mr. Speaker, so far as my abilities go, I am dangerous to every enemy of my country, and I am

so dangerous that I am going to expose them whenever I have the opportunity.

Another paper says that I am a reactionary, in addition to being dangerous. No real American who knows my record and philosophy and my background and my convictions will ever call me dangerous to American institutions. But this group that is dedicated to and is designed to overthrow and destroy our form of government proceeds to tell members of the Ways and Means Committee that I am dangerous. But they say also that I am reactionary.

They did not say that back in the old days when I stepped into the breach and saved the T. V. A. in its inception; when I saved the T. V. A. and guaranteed not only its creation but its completion; during all the days that I fought that battle on the floor I was not called reactionary; I was not called reactionary when I took the floor here in the interest of the development of the great Columbia River and prevented their cutting the Grand Coulee Dam off and making it a low dam and forever destroying that vast wealth of additional power that those people will receive for the next five hundred or a thousand years.

I was not called reactionary when I joined my distinguished friend and collaborator from Nebraska, George W. Norris—God bless his sacred memory—in helping to develop the water power of the Loup River as well as the tri-county project for the benefit of the people of Nebraska.

I was not called reactionary when I took the lead in developing the rural electrification program.

I was not called reactionary in 1938 here, when I bucked the leader of my own party and forced through the amendment for the first hundred million dollars for rural electrification that is today being reflected in a million farm homes of America.

I was not called reactionary back in the old days of the Coolidge administration. Do you know what they called me then? They called me the fiery Mississippi, the radical RANKIN from Mississippi. Why? Because I wanted to pay the soldiers adjusted compensation, and because I wanted to take care of the disabled veterans and their widows and orphans. They did not call me reactionary when I opposed the vicious provisions of the economy bill that sent many a poor disabled veteran to his grave broken-hearted because he knew they had shut the door of hope in the face of his widow and children.

I was not called a reactionary when I was fighting all the years I have been chairman of the Veterans' Committee to take care of disabled veterans and their widows and orphans.

Last year I was denounced as a radical, not a reactionary, by some of them because of my amendment raising the pay of the men now in the service to \$50 a month.

I have no apology for those acts. I would do the same things again.

Mr. Speaker, these same elements that are attacking me are attacking Great Britain. Read their literature. I can show you some here from a well-known commentator—I do not mean favorably

known—who has been maligning me over the radio and who comes out and denounces the British Empire.

Great Britain is our ally and she is an ally on whom we can depend. Let one of our aviators be shot down anywhere in the world and when his feet touches the soil of any English-speaking country he knows he is in an atmosphere of friendship and will be fed and housed at the nearest cabin.

Great Britain has been fighting a battle to protect her life line. I knew she would do that. Yet, this element that attacks me goes on the radio and through the radical press and elsewhere and denounces, bemoans, and abuses Great Britain for doing just exactly what we knew she would do. She will protect her life line at all costs. If she did not, God pity her.

Mr. Speaker, I want it distinctly understood that I am not criticizing any of our allies, but I am defending our great ally, Great Britain, which means the British Association of Nations.

As I have said before, these very forces that are attacking the Anglo-Saxon governments of the world are the same ones whose views are reflected by this left-wing radical group. What do they mean by Anglo-Saxon governments? They mean my government and yours. They mean the Government of the British Empire, they mean the Governments of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

I was one man in public life who did everything I could to prevent the outbreak of this war in the beginning, because I realized that the brunt of it would ultimately fall upon the English-speaking peoples of the world. We will never stand for the Japanese overrunning and destroying or dominating the white people of Australia or of New Zealand. Everyone knows that. Whenever Great Britain is attacked, why, of course, we want her to be right, but you know the feeling in the United States for the British Empire, and I am just an average American citizen who admires the British in a thousand ways, and who would not hesitate to criticize them in time of peace, at a time when it would not endanger the war effort. As I said, I have no criticism of other nations, but it makes me sick and tired to hear men on the radio, some Members of Congress, abuse Great Britain for taking that salutary step to preserve her life line in the Mediterranean. Cut that life line and Great Britain will fold up. She has no gas, no oil, and little or no water power in the British Isles. She has little or no raw materials. Her people are crowded. She has about 500 people to the square mile in Scotland, Wales, and England. Suppose you cut that life line, you not only knock Great Britain out of this war but knock her out probably as a permanent factor in the future civilization of mankind. I say now without any hesitation that no nation that has ever lived has contributed more to that civilization than have the people of the British Isles, from which my people came. As long as we are in this war together, we must stand together.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman was referred to as a reactionary. Here is the statement of a man who over the radio on December 10, broadcasting to millions of Americans, speaking as well to the people of the British Empire, made these statements:

But if your policy is the reactionary one of your Government, you must go your way alone.

Mr. RANKIN. Who was that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Walter Winchell.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, well.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is another quotation from this gentleman who assumes to speak for America—who, safe here in America, presumes to tell our allies what they should do. He said:

Why did you offer British troops to disarm Belgian patriots—people, whom you called noble allies only a month before? Frankly, we feel your Government must answer before history for breaking its word to the Belgians.

He also said, after referring to other acts of the British Empire:

All of these policies are of the same ignominious pattern—but in Greece, to be frank, we believe your Government has stained it with blood.

And then he continued:

What is wrong about a Greek loving Greece as much as an Englishman loves England?

That was Walter Winchell, who apparently grew black in the face, worked himself into hysterics, became almost incoherent, when he demanded that we aid Britain, get into the war.

That is the same Walter Winchell who befouled the air over a national hook-up with his vile, false charges against Americans who ventured to love America as a Greek loves Greece, as an Englishman loves England.

Is Winchell attempting to lower the morale of the men who, on the battle front, are fighting shoulder to shoulder with the soldiers of the Empire when he criticizes the policies of Great Britain? Winchell's friend, William Power Maloney, who procured the indictment of the so-called seditionists here in Washington for what he called a conspiracy to undermine the morale of our troops, might well ask Winchell whether he was attempting to create unity or disunity by criticizing Churchill and those who are determining the policy of Britain.

Will the gentleman say something about those quotations?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that Walter Winchell does not speak for me or any other American that I know anything about. His criticism, over the radio, of Great Britain at this time, when her boys are fighting and dying by the side of ours, so far as it goes, is most dangerous to Allied unity.

But this Popper letter goes on to say that I am an anti-Jew. Those patriotic American Jews who have come over here, or who were born here, and who are trying to help save America have never had any criticism at my hands; but I am not going to except one when I find he is a Communist trying to un-

dermine and destroy this Government, and I am not going to pass him over merely because he happens to be a member of the Jewish race. The decent Jewish people do not want me to do it. They are alarmed at some of the things these radical members of their race are doing.

He says I am anti-Negro. That is what this Communist said, that I am anti-Negro. I live in a section of the country that has had Negroes for 300 years. I have told you before that my people were slaveholders. They did not reduce the Negroes to slavery. They helped elevate them from the position of savage in which they were found to that of servants. Those people are still there.

Last year I saw an old Negro walking along the road down in my county. I stopped my car and told him who I was. He rushed over and grabbed me with both hands. He belonged to my great-grandfather. That is the way the decent white people of the South are regarded by the decent Negroes. He said another thing I will never forget. He said:

When your grandfather—

My great grandfather—

lived when we got old he took care of us. Now, I am old and got nothing and don't know where to go.

Let me say to some of you Members who are trying to use the Negroes for political purposes, you are doing them an irreparable injury. You are creating friction between them and the white people among whom they live that is likely to prove disastrous.

What have you ever done to feed and clothe the hungry Negroes of the South, as we white people have done in the years that have passed and are doing now? I am a better friend of theirs than any of these crackpot, radical, red agitators who go around over this country abusing the white people of the South in order to secure the Negroes' vote.

I remember one time De Priest, who was then a Member of Congress from Illinois, on the Republican side, came to me with a Negro from Tuskegee, Ala. They wanted some additional beds for the Negro veterans' hospital over there. I told them we had provided for them in the past, and would take care of their needs. Which we did. De Priest said one thing to me that I will never forget. He said:

Mr. RANKIN, you know I was a Negro before I was a Republican.

They tell you that I am anti-United Nations. Where did they get that? I supported Mr. Cox in 1920 when we had the League of Nations in our platform. This Popper letter says I am anti-labor. That is ridiculous, as everyone knows. But I am opposed to those racketeers who would prey upon the laboring people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest insults that has come to the Congress is this book which has been sent to every Member called *The First Round*. The first round in what? The first round in the destruction of our Government?

They published the statement that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee had 110 Members of this House who were responsible to them for their election,

They put this stamp on their backs and go out and brag about it. Sidney Hillman has been going over Europe bragging about how much power he has over the Congress of the United States. I would advise you Members who are on his list to repudiate that statement at once and give the world to understand you are not taking orders from Sidney Hillman and his gang. If you do not do it, you are going to find that stigma more painful and more embarrassing to you than the poisoned robe of Nessus, and more devastating in its ultimate results than the leprous cloak of Gehazi.

They bring out this book, *The First Round*, and I want you to read it. Let us see who wrote it. It was written by a man who calls himself Joseph Gaer. This book was sent to you by the C. I. O.-P. A. C., and purports to be an account of the accomplishments of the P. A. C.; that is, the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. That is exactly the way Hitler started; that is exactly the way Mussolini started; that is exactly the way other dictators have started in Europe.

At this time I should like to inform the House of the background of Joseph Gaer, the author of this book. Joseph Gaer is not his name. Whenever you come to me, always give me your real name. If you are known by two or three names, please give all of them. Joseph Gaer is not his name. He was born Eli Josef Fishmne in 1897 in Bessarabia, Russia. He came to the United States in 1916. He was naturalized in 1926, at which time he adopted the name of Joseph Gaer instead of Eli Josef Fishmne.

The C. I. O.-P. A. C. sent money into my district to try to defeat me. When the decent Americans I represent heard all this slush spouted over the radio, the resentment was so great that I was elected by the largest majority I ever received, and carried my opponent's home town 7 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, they call this their first round. I hope it is their last one.

The first round in the establishment of this Republic took place on the battlefield of Bunker Hill. Another round was when Thomas Jefferson and John Adams and those other great patriots of the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence. Another round was when George Washington and Benjamin Franklin and Alexander Hamilton and James Madison and others adopted the Constitution of the United States, which we are all sworn to uphold.

I for one expect to carry out that promise as long as I am a Member of Congress.

Now this committee must not be stacked. These Reds are reckoning without their host, if they think the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means are going to fall for that kind of propaganda.

We must elect a committee of real Americans who are not opposed to the policies and purposes for which it was created, in order that we may carry on this great work of protecting American institutions at home while our brave boys are fighting to protect them abroad.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment or two to defend the name of the gentleman from California mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to speak for a minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I desire also to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the limited time allotted will not permit me to take the well of the House in a detailed discussion of the charges raised by the gentleman from Mississippi, nor am I here to repudiate whatever support I may have had from organizations or individuals, but inadvertently or otherwise, the name of one of the most outstanding citizens of the State of California has been mentioned after a fashion that would lead people not fully informed to believe that the Honorable Robert W. Kenny, the attorney general of the State of California, was associated with subversive and un-American activities. I believe that it is not only right and proper for me, but incumbent upon any Californian, to make known, under these circumstances, to the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Robert W. Kenny is one of the most respected citizens of our State.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman tell me whose name that was?

Mr. KING. Mr. Robert W. Kenny.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought it was Philip David Swing. I was going to say I was complimenting him.

Mr. KING. Mr. Robert W. Kenny, Mr. Speaker, has held the distinction of occupying many offices of the State of California and is at the present time attorney general of that State. I have personally known him for 15 years; he is a member of the bar; a former municipal court judge of the city of Los Angeles, former superior court judge of the county of Los Angeles, was the senator representing the great county of Los Angeles in the Legislature of California; declined appointment to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and at the primary election in 1942 was nominated by both the Republican and Democratic Parties at the polls by one of the greatest votes ever accorded a man for this office, to the office of attorney general of our great State. Such a record of public confidence surely belies any possible connection with un-American or subversive activities.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. We have a list of special orders for Members who have al-

ready obtained permission to speak this afternoon, for a period of 1 hour and 45 or 50 minutes. If there is no objection by any of the Members who have already been recognized to speak later the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of information. I have introduced a resolution for the repeal of what is known as the Rankin amendment which created a standing committee commonly known as the Committee on Un-American Activities. I believe, as a matter of policy, this Congress should not set itself up as setting the standards of individuals or organizations, but should concern itself with legislation. It is not a question of whether the right-wing group control the committee and investigate the left-wing group, or the left-wing group investigate the right-wing group. I do not believe that the Congress of the United States should be established as an investigating agency to investigate individuals or organizations as such because in my opinion that is the purpose of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of the Army and Navy Intelligence Services. I hope that we do not establish a permanent investigating committee of this kind because we have had a very disturbing experience, to say the least, with the so-called Dies committee which has died a natural death because of the fact that the first step which was taken when the Gestapo in Germany was instituted was to investigate and then persecute certain citizens who did not believe in the philosophy of the Gestapo. I hope that does not happen in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business on Thursday of this week, and after other special orders heretofore entered have been completed, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

HIGHWAYS AND BRIDGES IN DEFENSE AREAS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the last Congress authorized an appropriation of a billion and a half dollars for post-war highway construction. No part of this vast sum is specifically allocated to defense areas, a provision which should be a primary justification of such a huge appropriation.

History will develop that one of the principal reasons for the loss of the first Battle of France, which brought on Dunkerque, was a lack of adequate highways to meet military requirements in that country. History will also show that the hard fight in defense of their homeland that the Germans have been able to put up has been largely due to the remarkable system of superhighways with which that country is interlaced. This has cost thousands of American casualties. Those roads are so constructed as to avoid bottlenecks and dead ends. They do not end at the city limits of large urban centers but carry through such areas with the same type of superhighways to be found in all of their defense areas. This has provided for mobility of operation so that troops have been effectively moved throughout Germany in the speediest possible manner to and through defense areas. Mr. Speaker, one need not be a military or a road expert to know these things, for they were referred to and were illustrated in American magazines before the war.

This is the very type of highway and bridge construction that we have neglected in the past and have further neglected to specifically provide for in the legislation authorizing appropriations for post-war highway construction. In many of our defense areas it can prove a tragic mistake unless it is rectified in time.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a strong advocate of the construction of major highways and bridges, for they are the arteries that give mobility to national defense in time of emergency, and they insure our economic well-being in time of peace. Inadequate bridges create bottlenecks in highways. A bridge is an integral part of a highway whether it crosses a creek, a river, or an arm of the ocean, as do the great Golden Gate and San Francisco-Oakland Bridges.

Among the very first States to embark on a campaign for more and better highways was the State of California. As long ago as 1907, Gov. James N. Gillett, a former Member of this House of Representatives, sent a message to the State legislature recommending a bond issue of \$18,000,000 for highways to be submitted to the voters of the State for their approval. I was a member of the California State Senate at that time and actively supported Governor Gillett's proposal without reservation, both in the State senate and in the following State-wide campaign. Many rural sections of the State were opposed to the proposal, and the bond issue would have been defeated if it were not for the enormous majority it received in the great seaport city of San Francisco.

In 1915 I was elected to the board of supervisors, which is the legislative body of the city and county of San Francisco. I continued my interest in highway and bridge construction by immediately starting a campaign to connect San Francisco, which is built on the tip of a peninsula, with its natural hinterlands, the San Joaquin, Sacramento, Livermore, Napa, Sonoma, Santa Clara, and Salinas Valleys, and the great redwood

empire, by a comprehensive system of highways and bridges.

In 1919, with the cooperation of Gov. William D. Stevens, who also served in this body, I initiated the successful State highway bond issue for \$40,000,000. At that time there was only a single highway and an antiquated ferry system serving the city of San Francisco, with a population of some 700,000 people.

My interest in adequate highways and bridges prompted me to initiate the Golden Gate Bridge by introducing the original resolutions in the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, one of which secured the original grant from the War Department to span the Golden Gate. This great bridge, costing \$35,000,000, was built at the depth of the depression without one dollar of Federal funds and with very little help from the State of California. From its inception to the present time I have continuously been a director of this publicly owned enterprise.

When officials of the War and Navy Departments opposed the construction of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, I personally appealed to President Hoover for his support. He responded favorably by appointing a commission which, after exhaustive study and investigation, unanimously approved a plan which found its climax in making this bridge a reality.

To further coordinate and increase highway and bridge facilities while chairman of the Committee on Highways, Bridges, and Streets of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I secured the enactment by the California State Legislature of laws permitting the union of two or more counties to form bridge and highway districts. It was this legislation which made possible the construction of such highways on the San Francisco peninsula as the Sky Line Boulevard, the Bay Shore Boulevard, and the reconstructed El Camino Real—the King's Highway. The hilly terrain of this area has made new highway construction a difficult engineering problem with consequent enormous relative costs.

Mr. Speaker, I speak of San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay area in particular because throughout more than 40 years of public service I have been directly and intimately associated with the problems of this important defense area and their relationship to our national defense. Highways and bridges are among the most important of these problems. The San Francisco Bay area is a major defense area; it is the key to the defense of our Nation along the entire Pacific coast, and as such it is imperative that sufficient highways and bridges shall be built to adequately meet any demands of military and naval necessity, either the rapid movement of troops or the huge movement of military and naval supplies.

I have previously called attention to the importance of the San Francisco Bay area and have referred to the testimony of high military and naval authorities before congressional committees on this matter.

In this present struggle San Francisco is one of the world's greatest ports of

embarkation and the tremendous military and naval activity now taking place in that area would astound the imagination.

I called the attention of the last Congress to these facts when the Federal-Aid Road Act was under consideration, but specific provision was not made to meet this situation from the national viewpoint. Instead it has been left entirely within the hands of the various State agencies.

In the important San Francisco Bay defense area are located some of the most important permanent military and naval establishments in the United States. They include the Presidio Military Reservation, one of the largest in the country and one which was established during the Spanish regime; Fort Funston, Fort Mason, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Miley, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, Mare Island Navy Yard, Hamilton Field Bombing Base, Alameda Naval Air Base, Oakland Naval Supply Base, San Francisco Air Base—Mills Field—used by both the Army and the Navy; Moffett Field, the United States Coast Guard Air Station at South San Francisco, the great naval base at Hunters Point, now one of the world's greatest naval repair bases, as well as a host of other war industrial establishments. In addition, a large percentage of food supplies and materials necessary to sustain our forces on the Pacific are produced in the Sacramento, Napa, and Sonoma Valleys, and in the great redwood empire, all adjacent to San Francisco Bay. They are brought into San Francisco over the Golden Gate Bridge.

Mr. Speaker, due to its geographical location and strategic importance it is imperative that adequate highways and bridges be constructed to provide for the heavy traffic continuously flowing between all of these military and naval establishments. Under the terms of the post-war Federal-Aid Road Act, California will be allocated \$67,000,000. At the present time it is essential that plans be prepared and carried forward for the construction of another bridge to connect San Francisco peninsula with the eastern approaches to San Francisco Bay. It should provide for automobile, bus, and railroad traffic and thus forge the link now missing in the flow of traffic between many of these permanent military and naval establishments. It should be of sufficient size to provide several lanes of traffic and thus not only relieve the heavy traffic now traversing the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which reached its capacity at rush hours before the Second World War began, but it will also greatly shorten the distances between many of these important national-defense establishments with consequent saving in time. This bridge should be built from a point adjacent to Hunters Point to Bay Farm Island on the eastern side of the Bay.

Likewise, at least one other wide freeway should be constructed up the San Francisco Peninsula into the city proper. Plans have been made for this projected freeway, but through lack of specific provisions in the Federal-Aid

Road Act passed by the last Congress allocating funds for defense areas, this legislation fails to encourage its construction into a completed project.

A third important project that should be undertaken at the earliest possible moment is to build the Sausalito freeway to the northern end of the Golden Gate Bridge in Marin County. This freeway or superhighway is needed to provide adequate approach to the Golden Gate Bridge from the north and to connect the extensive war industrial establishments which have come into being on the northern and northwestern shores of San Francisco Bay.

The experience of the present war indicates that more highways and bridges are necessary in defense areas—they are necessary for our national defense and for our peacetime economic well-being. Congress should see to it that funds from these appropriations, when made, are definitely earmarked to defense areas in sufficient amounts to guarantee our national defense. Otherwise it will not be done.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of the last Congress to specifically provide for highways in defense areas in the billion-and-a-half-dollar post-war Federal-Aid Road Act should not influence the judgment of the United States Public Roads Administration in its final determination of any road or bridge project on which Federal funds are used. When necessary, it should use its good offices to encourage national defense thinking in determining road projects on the part of State highway commissions in submitting their recommendations and should insist that projects be undertaken in all defense areas to insure our future security.

In addition, in those States, like California, where State laws require that highways be made a part of the State system before State or Federal aid can be given, steps should be immediately taken by State legislatures to place highways and bridges necessary to national defense in the State highway system.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I desire to commend the gentleman from California for bringing this matter before the Congress and to say that I previously served in the legislature as a member of the committee on highways, and consequently I know definitely not only the urgency of the matter which the gentleman is bringing before us, but I know his own contributions in the past to this subject. May I say further that I know of the help which has always been given by the San Francisco area to the road-building programs of the State, and I hope now that the gentleman's recommendations will be listened to by the Congress.

Mr. WELCH. I appreciate my colleague's observation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from California on his thoughtful and timely statement. It should be

noted here that the Golden Gate Bridge is really the culmination of a dream of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] and other Californians. On November 12, 1918, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], as a member of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, introduced a resolution that the feasibility of bridging the Golden Gate be investigated. To make a long story short, the plan to bridge the Golden Gate was found practical and the great bridge was built. It cost \$35,000,000 and will be entirely paid for by the people of California who reside in the Golden Gate Bridge Authority, which includes the county of Napa, in my district. This bridge was and is an important link in the defense system of northern California. It is part of the great highway system leading in and out of the metropolitan area comprising San Francisco Bay.

It should also be remarked that the construction of defense highways into a great defense area such as the San Francisco Bay area should be a Federal obligation. For almost 100 years we have had the Presidio of San Francisco and for centuries to come it will be the heart of the great system of defense installations in and around San Francisco. Needless to say, great highways must be a part of this defense set-up and as national defense is purely a Federal obligation, it should carry a part of the collateral obligation of providing a proper system and network of highways which will make the defense area most useful in the event of a need for defense. The suggestions of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], with his wealth of experience and understanding of this problem, should not only be given careful consideration but should be carried out.

Mr. WELCH. I appreciate the observation made by my colleague from California.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts and articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, American boys, who fight today around the globe, have earned the right to come home to an America of individual opportunity. But will these men come back to a land where the individual citizen can start a business, with a fair chance of success? Will they be able to found a little enterprise, with a few neighbors as stockholders, without having the cards stacked against them by government itself?

"No, they will not," is the answer to these questions, under present conditions. For small corporate enterprises have been steadily disappearing from the

American scene, under the impact of taxes, tax regulations, restrictions, and rulings. And that disappearance means that opportunity for individual initiative and personal independence is vanishing at an equal rate.

In the late political campaign, both parties agreed on restoration of opportunity for small business. President Roosevelt said at Boston:

We are going to see to it that those [veterans] who hope to establish businesses have a legitimate and fair opportunity to do so.

In his message to Congress last Saturday the President endorsed the principle of tax modification with which this discussion is concerned. Other powerful groups, such as the American Legion and labor, have given support to this restoration.

Despite official bipartisan support, what is the actual picture? Here are the statistics of new corporations in four leading States—New York, Illinois, Delaware, and Maine: In the bad year of 1932 there were 34,320 incorporations in these States. Despite general recovery from that depression low, the birth rate of new businesses has continued to decline. It reached an all-time low of 10,895 in 1943. But only a part of this alarming decrease can be blamed on the war, because in 1936, the banner peacetime recovery year, only 27,108 new corporations were organized in these States.

Similar evidence of the sterilization of new business is shown in the records of my own State, Nebraska. In the year 1929, 523 new corporations were organized. Likewise, by 1936, this number had declined over one-half to 253 new firms. By the year 1943 the strangling effect of governmental fiscal policies, plus the war, had reduced the number of new corporations to 92, less than 18 percent of the number organized in 1929. No Fourth-of-July oratory can obscure the decline in American opportunity and initiative portrayed in these figures.

The disappearance of individual enterprise is likewise clearly shown by the report on new businesses of all types, corporate, partnerships, and proprietorships, since 1933. From 1921 through 1932, there was an average of, roughly, 484,000 new business firms started each year. Yet that period was restricted by the consolidation craze, considered a major cause of the 1929 depression.

But from 1933 through 1943, only an average of 368,000 new businesses annually have opened. Here is an average annual decline of 116,000 firms, or 24 percent, for the years since 1933. In 1943, the total number of new businesses in the Nation was only 178,506, less than one-half of the 364,901 new firms in dismal 1932.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In connection with the number of corporations that were created, is it not also a fact that the corporations created were larger than those in the previous period?

Mr. BUFFETT. I do not have the figures as to the actual size of the corporations, but I have some other figures that I shall give later in this discussion on that very point.

This fact is noteworthy: Not since 1930 have as many new firms opened as in 1930, when 451,708 commenced operation. Yet that was the year after the 1929 crash. The best record in later years was in 1936, when 441,189 new firms opened their doors.

WHERE INCREASED INCOME GOES

But where is all our war-generated income going? The national income has increased from \$33,300,000,000 in 1929 to \$147,900,000,000 in 1943. Perhaps the best place to get a true picture is in the statistics of retail trade.

Total retail sales in 1929 are reported as \$48,459,000,000. By 1942 they had increased to \$57,684,000,000, a gain of 19 percent.

But the increase in retail sales has generally gone to the colossal chain and mail-order firms, as the following typical examples will show.

Sears, Roebuck & Co., retail sales (round figures):	
1929	\$403,000,000
1942	915,000,000
Montgomery Ward & Co., retail sales (round figures):	
1929	267,000,000
1942	632,000,000
Safeway Stores, Inc., retail sales (round figures):	
1929	213,000,000
1942	611,000,000
Walgren Stores, retail sales (round figures):	
1929	46,000,000
1942	95,000,000

The foregoing mammoth corporations show average increases of much over 100 percent. From these figures, for example, it seems certain that Sears, Roebuck is handling the retail purchases that formerly would have been made from hundreds of independent merchants. Those small enterprises diffused economic power and created individual opportunity for hundreds of people. Retail trade is one business where, by the nature of things, the maximum of opportunity should exist for small operators. Capital requirements are low and personal service and management are particularly effective.

But the opportunity for a new small enterprise to go into competition successfully with these giant corporations is practically nonexistent under present tax laws. While the large firm has other advantages, the unfair handicap of present tax laws on new small concerns is a decisive obstacle. The colossal chain-store corporation solves the difficulties, created by multitudinous and ever-changing tax laws and regulations, with regularly employed legal and accounting talent. Similar services are too costly for the individual small enterprise.

Frequently the obstacle created by the legal and accounting overhead required by tax laws and regulations is more discouraging than the taxes themselves. New enterprises must be set up to operate on a small overhead and with a minimum of employees. Present tax regulations make expensive legal and

accounting service practically compulsory, even before the new business opens, before it has a single customer or has made a single sale.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is making a very fine statement, and a timely one. Does not the gentleman agree that the time has passed, as a result of the policies that have been followed during the past 12 years or so, when a young man can start out on a shoestring and get into business for himself?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes, sir. That situation does not exist today.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is becoming increasingly difficult for a young man to become established unless he has a large amount of money?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to say the gentleman is making a very fine contribution and his legislation certainly points in the right direction. There must not be forgotten the very wholesome effect upon labor of what the gentleman is advocating. Its effect upon employment will be to increase employment. Whenever we have a situation where young men and others, wanting to start a new business, go into that business, they step aside and make a job for somebody else. If their new business succeeds they provide more jobs. As long as we continue the present policy of discouraging people from going into business we add to the number of people hunting jobs and we detract from the number of jobs available and we are doing a disservice to the laboring people of America.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I presume the gentleman, who is making a fine speech, noticed in yesterday's Star the tabulation made by someone referring to Jesse Jones, where he estimated the number of operating business firms in 1939 and 1943, showing that in 1939 there were 3,316,700 firms in business and in 1943 there were 2,780,300 firms in business, showing we have a loss of 536,400 business concerns in this country. I think that is a terrible condition when we realize that this Government is not encouraging small business but is putting the Government into business when we should let the individuals operate the business of this country, because I believe it is a wise thing to have freedom and liberty in the small business enterprise rather than to have Government regulation until they strangle them out.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course small business is being strangled by excessive tax-

tion made necessary by wasteful spending of this administration.

Mr. BUFFETT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. We hear a great deal about what we are going to do for the boys when they come home from the war. We are setting up a condition here under the bad fiscal policies of this administration, are we not, where it will be almost impossible, notwithstanding the fact that the Government is willing to lend money to put the boys back into business after they have sacrificed so much, to keep this country free, yet they will not have an opportunity to go into business because small business is going out instead of being maintained in this country. When they come home, possibly as part of their sacrifices will be to have more big business and less opportunity for the little man to go back into business.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is right. I cover that a little later on in my remarks, if I may proceed.

FISCAL POLICY VICIOUSLY OPPOSES NEW VENTURES

These conditions are explained by Peter F. Drucker, in the Saturday Evening Post, September 23, 1944, in the article entitled "Your Stake in Business Profits," when he said:

The shortsightedness of our present fiscal policy is most vicious in the case of new ventures—new plants or new processes. New enterprises are a more important national asset than our coal or oil, for we might find means to replace natural resources, but we would never be able to utilize what we have without initiative.

New ventures are the children in our economic system. Like children, they need special protection, but without them our economic system would soon die of old age. Never before has it been as important for this country to have an adequate supply of new enterprises as it will be when we switch from war to peace and when we shall have to find employment for the returning soldier.

If the grown and strong business needs some provision that enables it to set aside profits against future losses over a long period of years, the young and growing business needs special privileges—a lighter tax burden, maybe complete exemption from taxes on profits during the first 5 or 10 years of its life; the right to offset losses against profits over an extended period and to make unlimited provisions for depreciation, development expenses and emergency reserves, and so on. For it is only common sense to make the starting of a new venture as attractive as possible, and to make it easy for a new venture to grow healthily.

HEAVIEST BURDENS PLACED ON NEW FIRMS

Actually, our fiscal policy looks as if we had set out on purpose to make it unattractive to start a new business, and all but impossible to build one up. We give no special privileges at all to a new venture. We impose the same taxes on it that we impose on an old business—about as sensible as to put a soldier's heavy pack on the shoulders of a 3-year-old. We do not allow it to build up any reserves or any development fund.

Worst of all, we punish people for taking the risk of a new venture and reward them for investing their money unproductively. It would be very optimistic these days to count on a higher net profit than 2 percent on the invested capital from a new venture—what with the present tax rates and with

our unique system of double taxation, under which both the business and the recipient of its profits pay full income and surtaxes. And this 2 percent would have to cover all the risks inevitably inherent in any economic enterprise, but particularly in a young one. At the same time, we offer a riskless and taxless return of about 2 percent on Government bonds.

Thus, it is actually less profitable to invest even in a reasonably successful new business than to buy bonds—especially for the rich man. Of course, during the war we want people to buy War bonds rather than invest in industry. And to offer Government bonds as a safe investment for savings, for life-insurance funds, and so on, is perfectly sound.

But if we want new enterprise after the war, we must make it possible for the capital that has been accumulated by individuals and corporations as a result of past profits to assume the risks of an investment in the future. And that means that risk-taking must be rewarded and riskless investment discouraged.

As Drucker clearly points out, our tax laws have reached the stage where they crush and destroy the creative energies of our citizens. Spontaneous efforts to employ men by new firms are still-born. Let us face this situation honestly. A land where no new economic seed is able to germinate and flourish must soon become a Fascist or Socialist state. That means slavery and serfdom for all, except the politicians and bureaucrats. It is the fearful, but not improbable prospect, unless free opportunity is restored.

WET-NURSE SCHEMES WILL FAIL

Legislative efforts to solve this problem can take one of two courses: One method is to remove the shackles that have destroyed the incentives to start new businesses. The other method is via the route of governmental loans, bureaus of assistance, and other wet-nurse schemes, which have about the reviving effect on the true entrepreneur as a dose of strychnine. Practically, there is only the first method—that of removing the restraints that do not allow a new enterprise to be born and prosper.

Toward this purpose I introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress H. R. 5411—reintroduced the first day of this session as H. R. 365—a bill to create and expand post-war employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small business. The bill provides this encouragement by the very simple device of freedom from taxes and tax regulations, until the new business has had approximately 3 years to get on its feet.

To prevent this plan from being used for tax-evasion purposes, I have included a number of clauses designed to prevent its abuse. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that hearings will develop additional necessary safeguards. Likewise, it should not give inordinate advantages to new businesses as against existing enterprises. Under the terms of the bill, dividends and salaries would be restricted. Unless earnings were used to build up the enterprise, the firm would be ineligible for the benefits of the bill. The aids provided by this bill would go far toward the successful reestablishment of many firms that have been home-front casualties of this war.

From the standpoint of immediate Federal revenue collections, the effect of

this proposal would be negligible. The reason is plain. From Pearl Harbor to the end of 1943 there was a net decline of over 500,000 firms in America. Unless new businesses are founded, tax collections, regardless of rates imposed, will eventually decline seriously.

By encouraging the creation of small business, this Congress would be providing for an increase in revenues as new firms prospered and exemptions expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman from Nebraska is making a very fine, logical, and useful statement. One of the difficulties today is that the investor dare not invest. If he is asked to invest, the ordinary investor says, "Well, I have worked hard for my money. How long will it be before this enterprise will pay a dividend?"

The promoter will say, "Perhaps it will be 5 years."

The investor will say, "How much of my dividend will I get after paying taxes at the end?"

And the reply is, of course: "Under present tax laws, you will not get anything."

The result is the investor does not invest and your enterprise does not start.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is correct. My own experience of 16 years in the investment business has conclusively demonstrated the discouraging conditions facing investors.

PROPOSAL WILL ENCOURAGE WAR-VETERANS

Prompt action on legislation of this type should be encouraged by the increasing number of veterans returning to civil life. The loan provisions of the G. I. bill are designed to assist veterans to get into business. These business loans will be helpful only if the creation of new concerns is encouraged by sensible tax policies. Likewise this proposal would facilitate opportunity and jobs for civilians previously in war work.

The greatness of America has been founded on individual economic opportunity. For some years we have moved steadily toward the centralization of economic power that makes inevitable the centralization of political power. To reverse this fatal trend we must uncover and eliminate the governmental policies which accelerate the concentration of power.

A few days ago a Senate subcommittee commented:

As measured against the background of our economic needs, the post-war laws that have been enacted add up to very little. The balance sheet shows that the Seventy-eighth Congress never came to grips with the problem of providing an economic substitute for war production.

The truth of the foregoing self-criticism is generally acknowledged. This Congress can remove this economic road block by restoring the chance for a small business to be organized with fair opportunity for success.

If this needed legislation is to be properly considered, we must do so on our own initiative. The men who would start these new businesses obviously are unorganized and scattered. The only organ-

ized pressure would be on the other side, composed of corporations benefiting from Government policies that now encourage bigness and monopoly.

A recent War Department survey among soldiers found that "jobs without bosses" are the post-war preferences of the men in uniform. Only if the soldier can start with reasonable equality of opportunity can this hope be realized. That is one purpose of this bill. That objective deserves the earnest study of every Member of Congress. Our older generation was handed the priceless American heritage of individual opportunity, while this generation has fought to preserve it. So, we must recreate a climate for initiative and opportunity for them, else their battle against statism and totalitarianism abroad will be lost by those of us at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in his speech to Congress last Saturday the President made these statements:

We should also take appropriate measures in peacetime to secure opportunities for new small enterprises and for productive business expansion for which finance would otherwise be unavailable.

While no general revision of the tax structure can be made until the war ends on all fronts, the Congress should be prepared to provide tax modifications at the end of the war in Europe designed to encourage capital to invest in new enterprises and to provide jobs.

I am hopeful that with the encouragement that comes from his high office this Congress will get busy on the objective of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include the bill H. R. 365 at the end of my discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

H. R. 365

A bill to create and expand employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small businesses.

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 421 the following new supplement:

"SUPPLEMENT V—NEW CORPORATE ENTERPRISES
"Sec. 430. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"(a) In general: The tax imposed by this chapter, and subchapters B and E of chapter 2, shall not apply with respect to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in subsection (b)) for any taxable year beginning not later than 30 months after the organization of such enterprise if—

"(1) Limitation on amount of capital: The invested capital of such enterprise for such taxable year does not exceed \$100,000. For

the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (3), the invested capital shall be determined as provided in subchapter E of chapter 2, except that borrowed capital shall be included at 100 percent thereof in lieu of 50 percent thereof, and no reduction in average invested capital shall be made on account of inadmissible assets.

"(2) Limitation on character of income: 90 percent or more of the gross income (as defined in section 22) of such enterprise for such taxable year consists of income other than: dividends, interest, rents, royalties, gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets, or income which constitutes personal holding company income under section 502 (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f).

"(3) Limitation on dividends: The dividends paid or declared during such taxable year do not exceed in the aggregate 6 percent of the invested capital of the enterprise for such year.

"(4) Limitation on interest paid on borrowed funds: The interest paid, either directly or indirectly, to any shareholders, is not at a rate greater than 6 percent per annum.

"(5) Limitation to individual shareholders: At all times during the taxable year not less than 80 percent of the voting stock of the enterprise, and not less than 80 percent of the stock of all other classes, is bona fide owned by individuals, or by estates or trusts by reason of the death of former shareholders.

"(6) Limitations on salaries paid: There is no portion of the compensation paid to any employee during such taxable year which would not be allowable as a deduction under section 23 (a) (1) (A).

"(7) Limitation on character of assets: At no time prior to the close of such taxable year has the enterprise acquired, directly or indirectly, substantially all of the assets of another corporation or of a partnership or trust, or substantially all of the assets which were used in a trade or business carried on by an individual: *Provided, however*, That this limitation shall not operate against a new corporate enterprise acquiring the assets of a business discontinued as a direct result of the war.

"(8) Limitation of leases, etc.: At no time during the taxable year has the enterprise paid, or been required to pay, to any other person, pursuant to a lease, contract, or other arrangement, any amount which is determined with reference to the profits, income, or receipts of the enterprise and which constitutes gross income in the hands of such other person.

"(9) Taxable year to end December 31: The taxable year does not end on any date other than December 31.

"(b) Definition of 'New corporate enterprise': As used in this section, the term 'new corporate enterprise' means a domestic corporation which is organized, and actually embarks upon the active conduct of a trade or business, at any time after the date upon which this supplement becomes effective until the expiration of the 18-month period beginning with the month following the month in which the President proclaims the termination of hostilities in the present war."

SEC. 2. Chapter 6 of the Internal Revenue Code (capital stock tax) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 1208. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"The tax imposed by section 1200 shall not apply to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in sec. 430) with respect to a year ending on any June 30 if such enterprise is exempt under section 430 from the tax imposed by chapter 1 for its income-tax taxable year ending on December 31 of the calendar year in which such June 30 occurs."

SEC. 3. Part II of subchapter A of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (employers' tax under Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 1412. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"The tax imposed by section 1410 shall not apply to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in section 430) for any calendar year for which the enterprise is exempt under section 430 from the tax imposed by chapter 1."

SEC. 4. Subchapter C of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 1612. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"The tax imposed by section 1600 shall not apply to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in section 430) for any calendar year for which such enterprise is exempt under section 430 from the tax imposed by chapter 1."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman, by his instructive remarks, has just given a demonstration of how those who have recently taken their seats in this body can help some of us who have been here for a longer period and who it may be have dropped into a rut in our thinking.

I am familiar with the custom of the House and more especially the custom which formerly prevailed in the other body of frowning upon new Members who are anxious to take an active part in the proceedings of Congress.

To my mind there never was any justification for any such practice. Every Member in the House represents a constituency. His people elect him to represent them in Congress and unless I am grievously mistaken they expect him to do it.

Moreover, coming direct from the people unhampered by any of the red tape which prevails here in Washington or by the fixed opinions of bureaucrats and unaccustomed to taking orders, a new Member can give us many a constructive thought which will be of value to every Member of the House.

Well do I recall the day when in my first term I was admonished by a colleague who had served here for years, that when I had been here longer I would know more. I conceded his point as being well taken but I also told him that if he would go home once in a while, he could better represent his people; that he would speak more in accord with current issues. We were both right. So let me again thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] who has today introduced a bill which I hope will be favorably considered by the committee to which it is referred and later by the House.

It is my hope that during the coming session every Member of this body will take an active part in the discussions on the floor, in the committee work, and in legislation which he deems of interest to his district and the country.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Sunday Telegram captioned "America must be American to remain great." It is well written, timely, and logical.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 10 minutes.

A REPUBLICAN ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today should bring to Republicans new courage, new determination to serve with ever-increasing vigor the interests of their country.

One hundred and ten years ago there was a Republican celebration in the city of Washington. A dinner was served at Brown's Hotel at which some two hundred and fifty guests attended. The Vice President of the United States, the members of the President's Cabinet, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, many Members of the Senate and of the House, as well as distinguished officers of the Army and the Navy were present.

Andrew Jackson did not attend the dinner held in his honor, the dinner held to celebrate the victory at New Orleans and the payment of the last dollar due on the national debt. He remained at home, but sent down by messenger the following greeting:

Payment of the public debt. Let us commemorate it as an event which gives us increased power as a Nation, and reflects luster on our Federal Union, of whose justice, fidelity, and wisdom, it is a glorious illustration.

From the Washington Globe we learn that Thomas H. Benton officiated as President of the day; that he was assisted by Vice President James K. Polk, of Tennessee; William R. King, of Alabama; Henry A. Muhlenberg, of Pennsylvania; Silas Wright, Jr., of New York; J. M. Wayne, of Georgia; Isaac Hill, of New Hampshire; Bedford Brown, of North Carolina; Thomas Morris, of Ohio; Ratliff Boon, of Indiana; John Y. Mason, of Virginia; E. K. Kane, of Illinois; Philemon Dickerson, of New Jersey; and Joseph Hall, of Maine.

Also present at the meeting and addressing the meeting was Postmaster General Barry, Secretary of War Cass, and Vice President Van Buren, all of Andrew Jackson's political family.

Of the six counties in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, three bear the names respectively of Barry, Cass, and Van Buren.

The Globe of this city carried the following notice of the celebration:

REPUBLICAN CELEBRATION

The subscribers for the public dinner in this city, to be had this day, in honor of the extinguishment of the national debt, and commemoration of the Battle of New Orleans, are requested to call for their tickets at Brown's Hotel, prior to 5 o'clock p. m., this day.

The dinner will be served at precisely 6 o'clock, at Brown's Hotel, at which time and place invited guests and subscribers are re-

quested to attend. By order of the Committee of Arrangements. Thursday, January 8, 1835.

At the dinner Mr. Benton was the first speaker. I quote:

Gentlemen, we have met for the commemoration of two great events—the anniversary of the victory at New Orleans, and the extinguishment of the national debt.

Both events are worthy of celebrations, and must ever remain as eras in the history of our country.

The celebration of great national events is an obligation of duty and of policy. They do honor to the past and service to the future, paying the annual installments of an impayable debt of honor and of gratitude to those who have gone before, while planting the seeds of emulation in the bosoms of those who are to come after.

The immortal victories of Greece and Rome; did each, in its turn, save those republics but once? Or rather, did not each victory save the country many times, by the enthusiasm it excited, and the emulation it inspired? So of the great victory whose anniversary we now celebrate. Its memory shall fire the souls of the latest posterity and animate successive generations to the emulation of its heroic achievement and deathless fame.

The extinction of the national debt is an event of a different kind, more rare, but not less deserving of endless commemoration in the life of nations. How seldom can two such commemorations go together. Wars create debt; peace and economy extinguish them. The laureled general shines in the career of arms that loads his country with debt; the civil statesman pays off the encumbrance of military glory. How great, then, the felicity of him who, uniting in his own person the function of general and statesman, pays off in peace the debt of war. How many great nations, at this moment illustrated by victories, are yet loaded down with debt and with taxes. Our America, young, free, vigorous, is the grand and solitary exception. Her national debt has ceased to exist. The debt of two wars is paid off. And this beneficent consummation takes place under the civil administration of him whose career, connecting itself with both wars, furnishes the most brilliant event of our military annals. The national debt is paid. This month of January 1835, in the fifty-eighth year of the Republic, Andrew Jackson being President, the national debt is paid and the apparition, so long unseen on earth—a great nation, without a national debt—stands revealed to the astonished vision of a wondering world. At home, this great and rare event, the consummation of all hopes, the exaltation of all hearts, is also the admonition to sacred duties. It admonishes to the practice of economy. The reduction of burthens abroad, it is the exhibition of power. A nation without debt exhibits in the very fact of that disencumbrance the imposing force of a hundred thousand men in arms and a hundred line-of-battle ships at sea.

Now mark you, gentlemen, the celebration was a Republican celebration. It was a celebration of a great victory. It was a celebration of the wiping out of the national debt. What a contrast between that day and the day of the New Deal. It has been the New Deal fashion to attribute the depression of the early thirties to President Herbert Hoover, whereas in truth and in fact that depression was but the logical result of the false prosperity which followed the war which came during President Wilson's administration.

It is quite true that when Mr. Hoover left off we had a stupendous national

debt, but during the peace years which followed and under the policies of the New Deal and a President who had promised economy and retrenchment and a reduction of the national debt, that debt soared to astronomical proportions. It was increased by billions of dollars and the net result, after 7 years of public wasteful spending, was a nation with approximately 10,000,000 unemployed, and millions of others doing work which was being paid for out of public funds extracted from taxpayers.

But let us go back to the dinner of January 8, 1835. Mr. Polk delivered an address during which among other things he said:

Freed from debt, with abundant revenues to meet all the wants of government; relieved from the overstanding and corrupting influence of a moneyed corporation that has sought to sap and undermine the public liberty; in no apprehension from foreign enemies; and with a country enjoying at this moment a higher state of prosperity than at any former period, may we not, on an occasion like this, be permitted to felicitate ourselves and the great Republican Party of which we are members, for the support which we and they have strictly given to a course of public measures which have produced these great results.

Note these significant words. I quote again:

The great Republican Party of which we are members.

Up to that time there had been no national conventions. The Democratic Party was yet unborn. Thomas Jefferson called himself a Republican. In an early message, referring to political divisions, he said, "We are Federalists. We are Republicans." Madison, Monroe, and Andrew Jackson were Republicans. John Quincy Adams called himself a National Republican when the Federalists passed away.

The Democratic Party appeared during the Van Buren campaign in 1836 and then began its policy of claiming to be the offspring of everything that was good and great.

Since the Van Buren campaign in 1836, the Democratic Party has claimed Jefferson and Jackson as its godfathers.

It was in the gray dawn of January 8, 1815, that Jackson's band of deer hunters, hidden in the old canal on the battlefield at New Orleans, administered to Great Britain its greatest military defeat. The British lost 2,000 men, including General Pakenham. The Americans lost 21—8 killed and 13 wounded. That was an example of the greatest efficiency and economy in the military history of the world up to that time.

What a contrast between the thrift, the economy, the sound business principles of Andrew Jackson and the fiscal policy during peacetime of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Dealers.

A few days ago a gentleman who resides here in Washington, Francis N. Stacy, brought to my office a statement which so clearly contrasts the policies of Jackson and those of the New Dealers who now carry the banner of the Democratic Party that it is printed herewith. That statement in the language of Mr. Stacy follows:

SWIFT ECONOMIC EXPANSION FOLLOWING DEBT EXTINGUISHMENT, 1835-40

The appeal to the imagination of Europe was instantaneous and epoch-making. It was an appeal both to labor and capital, and world-wide.

A nation without a national debt and with almost no direct Federal taxes. A nation possessed of a billion acres of fertile wilderness in which a home seeker could buy an acre at the price of 1 day's labor and where a farmer could buy 100 acres at the cost of a half year's work. A beacon to the homeless of a debt-ridden world.

Immigration quadrupled as early as 1840. Gold imports increased by 160 percent for investment and American settlement.

From Britain and Ireland within the decade came 283,000 homemakers with \$60,000,000 in gold from the Bank of England. There were Irishmen for every city job, including Tammany Hall. Irish lassies furnished the womanpower to start the cotton mills, and New England cotton mills by 1840 were turning out a product valued at \$40,000,000 with a threefold increase of cotton goods for export.

From Germany, France, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and the Swiss Republic came 208,000 settlers to take up farms in the Middle Atlantic States and lay the foundation for the Middle West.

When the first agricultural census was taken in 1839, 4 years after debt extinguishment started the west-bound caravans of farm seekers, wheat crops of the United States swiftly jumped to 84,923,000 bushels, the corn crop to 377,531,000 bushels, and the livestock to 14,971,000 cattle, 19,311,000 sheep, and 26,301,293 hogs.

Will New Dealers please note: In the philosophy of Andrew Jackson there was no killing of 6,000,000 little pigs to produce prosperity by making pork scarce, but farm prosperity jumped by raising 26,301,293 full-grown hogs with ham and bacon for every home and millions for export to porkless Europe.

Andrew Jackson, instead of plowing under the hogs and cotton and piling up the debt and taxes, adopted the opposite philosophy. He doubled the production of hogs and cotton in 5 years, and well-nigh abolished the debt and taxes.

Instead of plowing under 10,000,000 acres of cotton, Andrew Jackson increased the cotton production from 732,000 bales in 1830 to 1,347,000 bales in 1840, and cotton exports jumped from 298,000,000 pounds in 1830 to 743.9 million in 1840. In 5 years after Jackson lifted the debt burden from American free enterprise, he doubled both production and domestic exports, while reducing the interest burden on public debt to 1 cent per capita.

In the second year of debt extinguishment, the assessed valuation of New York City realty increased 100 percent by reason of the home building and factory building to provide for the new immigration.

In the third year of debt extinguishment, the commerce of New York Harbor increased by 100 percent through fleets of crowding ships.

On January 8, 1836, just 1 year after abolition of American public debt, a Pittsburgh newspaperman counted in Pittsburgh Harbor, where the Allegheny and Monongahela join to form the Ohio River, 37 Mississippi River steamboats loading freight and passengers for the new migration into the Middle West. Mississippi Valley doubled its population by 1840.

Illinois in Jackson's day was a frontier State. In 1832, Illinois cast only 21,468 votes for President. In 1840, after two White House terms of debt extinguishment and farm expansion, Illinois cast 93,177 votes for President—a 600-percent gain in 8 years of free enterprise.

Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire was Jackson's Secretary of the Treasury and ex-officio United States Land Commissioner. He had a billion acres of public land to settle with home and farm seekers. In Illinois he opened 10 United States land offices. Note what happened when the immigration flood broke loose in 1835 when the public debt was lifted.

In 1834, the year before debt extinguishment, Illinois land sales were only 354,000 acres. In 1835, the sales immediately jumped to 2,096,600 acres, and in 1836 to 3,199,700—a ninefold gain in 2 years.

In 1835, Woodbury opened a land office in Chicago. In 2 years Chicago land sales reached 806,000 acres—which laid the foundation for Chicago. In 4 years, by 1839, Chicago's lake traffic in west-bound freight and passengers and east-bound wheat employed a fleet of 49 steamboats and 363 sailing vessels. The population of Illinois grew from 157,000 in 1830 to 475,000 in 1840, and 851,000 in 1850—and Chicago became the emporium of the Middle West.

Michigan Territory, which in 1830 had only 31,639 people, was admitted into the Union as a State by act of Congress of June 23, 1836, approved January 26, 1837, with 212,267 citizens in 1840—a sevenfold gain within 5 years after debt extinguishment brought labor and capital to develop mines, lumber, and farm lands—and Detroit came on the economic map. General Cass, of Michigan, was Jackson's Secretary of War.

Missouri, whose Senator Thomas H. Benton presided at the first Jackson Day dinner at Brown's Hotel, increased its population from 140,455 in 1830 to 383,700 in 1840, and 682,000 in 1850—and St. Louis, followed by Kansas City, came on the United States map as the gateway to the far West.

The 14 States bounding the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and the Great Lakes—the agricultural and industrial empire which in marked degree owes swift development to the westward trek, inspired by payment of the public debt—have, with only 2 exceptions, a Jackson County as a tribute to their far-visioned founder. Within 5 years after January 8, 1835, their aggregate population increased by 3,070,000, or approximately 60 percent. In striking contrast, the same States in the recent decade 1930-40 increased their aggregate population under a mounting public debt and tax burden by only 6 percent. Even numerically, after 100 years of population growth, the 1930-40 decade of mounting debt and taxes has added no more people to these 14 States than in the pioneer days of Jackson's debt extinguishment in 1830-40.

Both American shipbuilding and American railways owe their great expansion to the Jefferson-Jackson financial program which brought the needed cash capital from Europe, as well as the needed immigration and commerce.

In 1830, 5 years before payment of the public debt, United States had only 23 miles of operating railway, and American ships built that year grossed only 58,580 tons.

In 1840, 5 years after lifting the public debt, operating railroad mileage increased one hundredfold, to 2,818 miles, then to 9,021 miles in 1850, and 18,374 in 1855, and the United States soon led the world in transportation by rail.

Our shipbuilding doubled to 121,203 tons in 1840, doubled again to 279,255 tons in 1850, then doubled again in 1855 to 583,450 gross tons, which was the highest shipbuilding record of the nineteenth century.

Railway building, which received its first great impetus from the capital brought from London and Amsterdam by the lifting of the public debt, was followed by the development of America's iron, steel, and coal industries.

American pig iron production rose swiftly from 165,000 tons in 1830 to 286,903 in 1840,

563,755 in 1850, and 700,150 in 1855—more than quadrupling within 20 years after the first Jackson Day dinner in honor of the extinguishment of the national debt.

Exports of American iron and steel manufactures increased tenfold during the same period after the famous Republican celebration.

Coal production made a like advance: Only 285,779 tons in 1830, rising to 1,848,249 tons in 1840, 6,266,233 in 1850, and 11,541,672 in 1855—a fortyfold development in the first 20 years after the 250 guests at the first Jackson Day dinner rose and cheered Andrew Jackson's toast—"Payment of the public debt."

In 1836, the very first year after the public-debt purge, the first American labor union was formed and the first wage boost was granted.

In the agricultural census of 1860, 25 years after that dinner at Brown's Hotel, the value of American farms and farm property, including \$1,089,000,000 of livestock, exceeded \$9,000,000,000—approximately four times the farm value on the first Jackson Day—and the boys in blue and gray on the Civil War front the next year had 848,000,000 bushels of corn in the crib and 33,512,000 hogs in pen to furnish pork and corn ponies—no little pigs plowed under.

THE REVELATION AND THE EXODUS OF JANUARY 8, 1941

For 105 years up to and including January 8, 1940, the Democratic Party celebrated from year to year the Jackson Day dinner of January 8, 1935, at Brown's Hotel in blissful ignorance of the historic significance of the event. On January 8, 1940, the celebration rose to the magnificence of a dinner at \$100 a plate at the Mayflower, with the President and his Cabinet and all Democratic leaders in attendance, full dress.

Then, as January 8, 1941, approached and after the official announcement was published, the hideous news broke:

1. That they had been celebrating the extinguishment of the national debt during the preceding 8 years, while piling up the debt threefold in peacetime.

2. That they were celebrating the Battle of New Orleans, where the American loss was only 21, while the loss of the British, their present allies, had been 2,000, including the British commanding general.

3. And, most astounding of all, they, for 105 years, had been holding what Andrew Jackson and his committee of arrangements had officially termed a "Republican celebration."

Then came shuffling of dates, the manufacture of sudden alibis, and the exodus from high places in Washington, D. C.

On January 8, 1941—11 months before Pearl Harbor—the President and every Democratic Member of his Cabinet were from 1,000 to 3,000 miles away from Washington.

The Commander in Chief and his aides de camp, Attorney General Jackson and Harold L. Ickes, boarded the yacht *Potomac*, the Commander's flagship, and hastened for the Gulf of Mexico, where they took refuge in a bay off the coast of Florida.

Postmaster General Walker and Secretary of Commerce Jones likewise had a yarn for the Gulf of Mexico. Madam Perkins flew 2,000 miles to New Mexico. Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., the guardian of the public debt and the Treasury deficit, took the longest flight of all and did not land until he reached the cactus groves of Tucson, Ariz. These flights were followed by an amazed American press. What could it mean?

When Jackson Day, 1941, arrived the only members of the Cabinet in Washington were the Republican members. They possibly remained because Andrew Jackson had declared the day a Republican celebration. They, moreover, had had no hand in piling up the debt. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., evidently took

the longest flight of all because he had just asked Congress to extend the debt limit to \$65,000,000,000, or four times the debt of 1932.

The Commander in Chief was in the worst plight of all. A poet had one time said: "Up from the South at break of day, the affrighted air with a shudder bore, etc.—and Sheridan 50 miles away." And here, on Jackson Day, the Commander is 1,000 miles away—and he did not come back for a week or so.

In a safe place down in the Florida Everglades, where no newspaperman could interview and harass, he made a speech—without reference to Andrew Jackson, or to the Battle of New Orleans, and without responding to Jackson's toast:

"Payment of the public debt: Let us commemorate it as an event which gives us increased power as a Nation, and reflects luster on our Federal Union, of whose justice, fidelity, and wisdom, it is a glorious illustration."

Since Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, the Democratic Party may be forgiven for the nonobservance of Jackson Day. As war exponents and allies of the British the administration naturally is excusable for forgetting Jackson Day. But the January 8, 1941, celebration in the Florida Everglades was 11 months before Pearl Harbor, and, presumably, was not in the cards. Or, was it? And, did Harold Ickes have ready a smear oration on "Isolationists"?

What will be the future of Jackson Day in American history? It is safe to say: (1) That it will not be celebrated until this war is over, (2) that it will not be celebrated then by the New Deal Party.

Appropriately, it might be celebrated by the Jefferson-Jackson Democrats who are now out of power. Appropriately, likewise, it might be celebrated by the Republican Party. Reduction of the public debt, and the avoidance of Treasury deficits, has been the pride of Republican administrations since the Civil War. The debt of the last World War was reduced from \$26,000,000,000 in 1920 to \$16,000,000,000 in 1932.

Therefore, it may well be that when the fourth and/or fifth terms are over, and war no longer can be prolonged, Jackson Day may be restored to its time-honored place in American history under a Republican administration of which Jefferson-Jackson Democrats are members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement relative to universal training.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday I addressed the House, having waited here until half-past 2. When I finished I took occasion to get a bite to

eat, and while I was having my lunch the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], one of my congenial friends in the House, made certain remarks about me. I always believed that when one Member intended to say something in reference to another Member he ought to invite that Member to be present on the floor of the House if possible. I am therefore very glad that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is present at my invitation this afternoon.

The gentleman's speech was captioned "No partisan politics." In that connection, may I say to the gentleman from Texas that so far as partisan politics are concerned there is not a Member of the House nor a man who has ever been a Member of the House who does not know that I am a real ripsnorting Republican. I take great pride in that fact. I have always felt a lot of satisfaction in supporting Republican policies and principles, believing them best for our country. However, above all else I want to be a good American. Regardless of what your politics may be on that side of the House, whether Democrat or New Deal, it is for you to decide when it comes to doing the things that are for the best interest of this Government. I want to do what is the best for our country. As long as I am a Member of the House the time will never come when I shall bury myself just because something I may say or do might hit the New Deal. I will criticize anyone when I believe he or she is wrong. I will not let them go unchallenged.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to do or say anything that will in any sense interfere with the winning of the war, and I am going to be very careful about that, because I am as much interested in that as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] or any other Member of the House. As I stated, I would be most reluctant to say or do anything that will in any way hinder our war effort or that might prevent us from winning the war and bringing our boys back as soon as possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. For a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said he is proud of being a Republican. That is not anything new for people to be proud of. Way back on January 8, 1835—that is 110 years ago—Polk, speaking here in Washington, said that he was proud to be a Republican, in substance, and he referred to the great Republican Party and all of those present at that dinner said they were Republicans. In one of his messages Thomas Jefferson called himself a Republican and said, "We are Federalists, we are Republicans." Madison, Monroe, and Andrew Jackson were Republicans. The gentleman has a long, long list of great men to follow.

Mr. RICH. I have a long list of great men behind me in the Republican Party and I hope a great many good Republicans will be here in years to come as President, as Speaker, and as Members of the House, and all departments of Government. Yes; I say good Republicans.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. If I can have additional time, Mr. Speaker, I will yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no request pending before the Chair at this time. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. SABATH. In 1862 the party which was then known as the Republican Party changed its name and became a real democratic party. It became the Democratic Party. All those that the gentleman designated as Republicans were in heart and principle Democrats.

Mr. RICH. You know I believe in the principles of Jeffersonian democracy. But I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is he a New Dealer or a Democrat? I like Jeffersonian Democrats.

Mr. SABATH. I am a Democrat and a New Dealer because a Democrat stands for the New Deal and a New Dealer stands for democratic principles.

Mr. RICH. I have no time for the New Deal. It is wrecking American democracy, destroying our Constitution, taking away our liberties, and enslaving our people.

Mr. SABATH. I am going to help the people—

Mr. RICH. I do not yield for any New Deal theories.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. SABATH. I ask for order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman who does not know whether he is a New Dealer or a Democrat is interrupting. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to any length of time, but I just want the gentleman to know that I will give him notice today that I do expect to comment on some of his remarks so that he will be present. I thought the other day he would be here, because he was here when I received consent, and he remained here quite a long time, and I did not anticipate he would leave. I am very sorry that I did not give him notice then, but I will give him notice now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I will be present to hear the gentleman from Texas. I call attention first to the item in Mr. PATMAN's remarks entitled "Cannot Balance the Budget During the War." May I say to the gentleman from Texas that I did not say the Budget should be balanced at this time. I realize that when we take in about fifty-five billion and we are spending close to one hundred billion it would be just foolhardy for anyone to suppose that that could be done. That would not be sound business, and I hope that I left no impression on the mind of anyone here that it could be done.

However, I do call your attention, Mr. PATMAN, and the Members of the House, to this, that for 10 years I tried to get

you gentlemen over on this side of the House to economize in government, at a time when the President of the United States made some of the finest statements that any man ever made—that we ought to have economy in government. But instead of trying to economize and instead of trying to consolidate bureaus and eliminate offices, as he promised, you went out on a splurge of spending such as was never known in the history of this Nation and established more bureaus, and every year since Mr. Roosevelt has been in office you have been in the red from a billion and a half to five billion dollars in peacetime. Look where you are going, since we started in the war; spending over \$7,000,000,000 a month more than our receipts. It is terrible. It is going into bankruptcy.

May I call attention to the statement that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made here, "The country cannot go bankrupt." If you will read the statement that I quoted in the RECORD from Mr. Roosevelt's speech, when I talked on last Thursday, referring to the speech that he made on October 19, 1932—and I will insert that in the RECORD here again:

The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

So that regardless of anything that the gentleman from Texas might say, notwithstanding to the contrary, we are on that road. The point I want to make is this: I want to stop reckless expenditures of Government funds, and if you gentlemen on that side do not try to economize now in the operation of Government, it is going to be the most serious thing that has ever happened to this Nation of ours. Our financial structure will topple over.

Again I quote the gentleman from Texas: "The country cannot go into bankruptcy. In truth and in fact our country cannot go bankrupt. It is absolutely impossible." Now, that is the gentleman's own statement. "Bankruptcy presupposes inability to pay a debt or debts. The time will never come when the Government will not be able to pay those debts. There is the point we should watch. There is the problem we should solve, the value of that money." I am surprised. I am really surprised the gentleman from Texas would make such a foolish and, to me, ridiculous statement. Do you know what happened to Germany after the last World War? Why, it got so you could buy German marks for 2 cents, then you could buy German marks for 1 cent. A lot of our people bought them. After a while you could buy a million marks for a cent and a short time after that a billion marks for 1 cent. You could get a whole bushel of them for a cent. They were never worth it. So Germany went bankrupt; and so will the

United States of America if we do not be frugal, if we are not careful in what we do and how we do it. The New Deal is and will be responsible for it, so make no mistake about that point.

That same thing can happen to America as long as you try to go on that way. I do not believe in any such a thing that we cannot go in bankruptcy. I do not think we can ever spend ourselves into prosperity, as was said here a few years ago, by this administration, "Spend, spend, spend; elect, elect, elect." That is what you have been doing.

I believe in a sound dollar, a sound monetary value, a sound economic system. You can have that only when you work and receive an honest dollar for your work, when you do something and are paid in honest dollars. When we obligate ourselves for something we expect to get something in return for that obligation whether it is work or merchandise or service rendered.

I do not think you can pay men for doing nothing. That is what this administration started to do. It started to pay the farmers for not raising foodstuffs; it started to pay men for not working, for not doing this, and for not doing that. That is an unsound economic system. I believe in work, I believe in earning, I believe in saving, and I believe in a sound monetary value.

Last Thursday I commented on the fact that Marvin Jones says we must have more foodstuffs to feed our allies and our own people. I agree with that and am in sympathy with it. I want to do it. But then Mr. Byrnes says we are going to take men off the farms. That just does not make sense. I am a farmer. I have a farm, and I know that if I want to produce I either have to get out there myself and work or have someone else do the work. I am not thinking about my own farm; I am thinking about the farmers who are out from daylight to dark expending every ounce of energy and effort they have to produce the foodstuffs that Marvin Jones wants: to milk the cows and furnish butter and milk. If you take the men off their farms so they cannot milk their cows, you will have to get rid of the dairy herds. If you do not have enough men on the farms to plow the soil and put in the crops you will not reap, because you must sow if you are going to reap. Therefore, in order to do that, you either have to let the men stay on the farms or get the IV-F's or men in nonessential industries and enterprises and put them on the farms. The point I want to make is this, and I have said it before and repeat it now. You have to work. You cannot take men off the farms if you want to produce.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter dated January 5 I have received from the president of the Dairymen's League. That will show the Members of the House just what I mean.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the letter reads as follows:

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE,
CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, January 5, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed herewith is a letter addressed to War Food Administrator Marvin Jones and Director of Selective Service Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

Anything which you can do to protect the dairy industry against the drafting of too many of these men will be of vast service not only to farmers but to the Nation as well. The broad terms in which this announcement has been made and the newspaper publicity which has accompanied it will undoubtedly cause many local draft boards to go far beyond the intention of Mr. Hershey or Mr. Byrnes and very far beyond the intent of the Tydings amendment.

Already information is coming to us regarding farmers who are becoming panicky and are preparing to dispose of their herds. As you so well know, the peculiarities of dairy production do not lend themselves to unskilled transient or seasonal labor.

The full effect of draft boards' actions on dairy farm help will not be felt for several months and by that time the damage will be irreparable. The terms of and the publicity accompanying the announcement are extremely unfortunate, and, we are informed, do not convey the actual intention of the Administrators, but the effect will be the same.

Anything which you may be able to do to get this matter clarified so far as dairy farming is concerned, which is more than one-half of agriculture of this area, will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRED H. SEXAUER,
President.

The fourth thing I want to talk about today is nonpartisan politics and constructive criticism. I have tried to show you that the various organizations of government ought to get together before giving things out to the public. Sometimes I think you know nothing about the operations of the Government. I called your attention last Thursday to the fact that we ought to know definitely what we are going to do about spending before we bring any bill into the House. I claim that the New Deal organization or the Democratic Party right now is weaker than weak because it does not coordinate its Committee on Ways and Means, the Speaker of the House, and the majority leader, and the Appropriations Committee. You might also take into account the minority leader. He is a great man over here and ought to be consulted on various bills, because if he is right he can advise all the Republicans and they will come along, at least they will give consideration. The Republicans will vote for things that are good and sound and sensible. We are here today to win this war and we dare not get into a rumpus; but you dare not overlook the fact that you have to get a little common sense into the organization you have here. You have to get a little business ability into the operation of your party if you are going to succeed in the winning of this war. So I appeal to you before any legislation is passed. Consider, is it necessary, is it worth while, does it have to be passed now? Will it help win the war? Do we have the money to make it effective?

Statements have been made to the papers lately about winning the peace

when the Great Three, as we call them—Mr. Stalin, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Roosevelt—are at loggerheads about some things they are going to do. They should get their heads together on how we are going to settle these affairs. Look at the situation in Poland, in Greece. Mr. Roosevelt says we want a just peace. I want a just peace, but I want to know how they are going to get it. I want to know what Mr. Roosevelt's aims are in his foreign policy. I should like to know what he is going to try to do and what those other nations want to do—if they want us to follow them. I am first, last, and all the time for America. Then I am willing to help all these foreign countries and use our good offices in any way we can if it is possible for us to do so. I want to help them all, but I do not want to help them when I know it is going to wreck America, because I do not think it is necessary to wreck America. I am here, sent here by my people, to try to guard against that very thing. And you can rest assured I will not let the New Deal get me to do otherwise. We have no time to fool away, no time to do the wrong thing, so beware. Be on guard at all times. All I can say now is be American.

What are we doing? We are sending our boys over there to fight for the purpose of trying to keep America safe and sound and secure. We are trying to help and aid and assist all of our constituents and all of our people and make this a great country and keep it a great country. We have had a great country. Now let us not permit radical individuals in this country who want to tear it down and want to make it become communistic get control of it. I am against communism. I am like JOHN RANKIN here awhile ago when he says, "Let first things be first." I do not want The First Round. Sidney Hillman is not the fellow I want to follow, nor the C. I. O., nor the P. A. C., in the way they are trying to come in here and domineer this country of ours and make it communistic by electing radicals, by being communistic.

Whenever I have to clear my remarks with Sidney Hillman, and I hope that time will never come, but when, if I have to do it, it will be at the point of a gun or a sword. And further, I want to say communism is coming to this country fast. Whenever that time comes, God save America. I will show you some of the literature Sidney Hillman put out against me in this last campaign. He got some dandy literature out. It is published by the Citizens Political Action Committee, 314 Court Street, Williamsport, Pa. I do not feel as if he did something wrong to me. He can publish those things. He can lick me at the polls if he gets the votes. But the people sent me down here nevertheless. I am not Sidney Hillman's tool and I am not going to do what Sidney Hillman wants me to unless Sidney Hillman and Browder and these Communists who are working for that organization feel that they can get control of this country, then they might compel me at the point of a sword; that is the only way they are going to do it.

Now, I realize here when you talk about politics and getting into politics, I noticed before I came back here, that anything that a Republican says there are always three or four Democrats here ready to get up and challenge him. Well, that is all right from the Democratic side, but I hope that the Republican Party will look after the Republicans on this side of the House. I am sure they will, with JOE MARTIN and the other fellows with them.

We are going to look after our boys and we are going to take care of them. But we want our boys on this side to be sound, to be conscientious, to be honorable, and to be true to their convictions and true to this Constitution of ours which they have sworn to uphold and support. If we do that same thing on that side of the House we will get together, Mr. PATMAN, and we will do what you would like to see done, get out and win this war and bring the boys back home. I know you want that. I know that all the fellows on this side, all the Members of Congress, want that, and the quicker we do it the better. But let us get ourselves in shape by trying to not misquote people. I do not intend and do not want to be misquoted. I am not going to take it. I shall battle anybody, I do not care who he is, who gives a wrong inference to anything that I may have to say.

I came here to work. It is an easy thing for me this afternoon to quit and get out of here. I could go out. But it takes a little bit of time and a little bit of our ability and a little bit of ingenuity and a little bit of common sense, and we have got to have that, and lots of it. So, with that, I hope that in the future any comment that is made will be made with the idea of constructive criticism. I hope that you fellows on that side of the House will take it in the way in which it is intended to be given and that in the future the things we do here and the things we say here and the things we stand for will be for true, sound Americanism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPARD). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 50) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized, effective January 4, 1945, to conduct such studies and examination of the organization and operation of any executive department or any other executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction.

For the purposes of this resolution, such committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attend-

ance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WARTIME FINANCIAL AND BUSINESS DIFFICULTIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was not my purpose to misquote the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If he would point out where in any respect I have misquoted him in the statements that I have made I shall be very glad to make necessary corrections. I do not think, however, that he can point it out.

Regarding the bankruptcy of a nation, no nation can go bankrupt which has the power to issue the money to pay its debts. That is the problem we must guard ourselves against, printing-press money and unlimited supplies of money. The gentleman put his finger on it when he referred to Germany. In Germany at one time it required whole wheelbarrows full of printing-press money in order to buy a morning paper. Germany did not go bankrupt. Germany paid her debts; but she paid her debts with worthless money. That is what we want to avoid. That is the reason I said it is not a question of bankruptcy, it is a question of cheap money, ruinous inflation, runaway inflation, worthless money for which people in this country will not work.

Before I comment on the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] I wish to say a few words about the statements made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT]. The gentleman from Nebraska made a very interesting speech. I am not going to question a single fact he told us. He has the information, I do not, concerning the things about which he spoke. But I do want to suggest that possibly some people might get the wrong impression about certain statements he made and I want to invite it to his attention. For instance, he said that in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and one or two others from 1932 to 1943 the number of corporations doing business was reduced from 34,000 to about 10,000. On its face that looks like a very alarming and disturbing statement. Doubtless it is true, the gentleman looked it up. Yet it might possibly not mean a thing in the world for the reason that under our tax laws that he discussed a corporation under the Constitution of the United States is a citizen, and whenever you set up a citizen between you and your money that citizen that you create artificially must pay taxes to the United States Government and in addition you must pay taxes on your dividends from the corporation. It is in your interest therefore to take that citi-

zen away and do your own business. For this reason, in a number of States many corporations have been converting to partnerships as fast as they could. They save enormous taxes that way, it is good business. I do not blame them for it, it is perfectly all right. But if they want to be protected from personal liability they set up this artificial citizen between them and personal liability. They are now willing to remove that artificial citizen and save the taxes because taxes are so high. So, alarming as that statement seems, possibly only a few corporations went out of business but converted to partnerships.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I quoted figures awhile ago showing that the number of industries that were in business in 1939 as given in the Sunday Star—

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I read that statement.

Mr. RICH. Quoting from Mr. Jones, that there was a loss in the number of businesses of 536,400 from 1939 to 1943.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is greatly disturbed about that, but I am not a bit in the world and I will tell you why. Normally there are a thousand new businesses going into operation every morning, and normally a thousand businesses close their doors every night. Normally we gain a thousand and lose a thousand every day. That is in normal times. In wartimes we have been losing a lot but have not been gaining any. We are therefore getting ready for the post-war period. That is the reason for that great loss. On its face it sounds like a very disturbing statement, but when you come to analyzing it, it turns out not to be so disturbing after all except to cause us to be on our toes to try to do something in the post-war period that will reestablish those small businesses.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is the gentleman operating any kind of business today?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not engage in personal interrogation.

Mr. RICH. I beg the gentleman's pardon and will withdraw the question. In its place I will make this statement: I happen to be in business and I know that it is most difficult to do business today and people are getting out of business rather than operate because of high taxes and the troubles of asking bureaucrats whether you dare buy this, whether you dare sell it, and how much you can get for it. You do not run your own business at all, it is run here in Washington. The result is that thousands are getting out of business.

Mr. PATMAN. Since the gentleman has mentioned the matter and said he was in business himself, I will ask him this question: Has the gentleman's business been better the last 12 years than it was the previous 12 years? And how did his business in 1944 compare with his business in 1932?

Mr. RICH. I wish to say this to the gentleman—

Mr. PATMAN. I just want an answer to that simple question.

Mr. RICH. Very favorably.

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, they have not hurt the gentleman at all.

Mr. RICH. No; I do not think they have.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has been making plenty of money, even though he is a small businessman.

Mr. RICH. We run a good business, try to be conservative, economical, and run our business on sound principles; and we look after the people who work for us, because they are the very heart of our industry.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is getting off onto something else. How does it compare today with what it was in 1932?

Mr. RICH. Let me answer that.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will just give me time.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can get time in his own right.

Mr. RICH. I will tell the gentleman of an experience I had this week with O. P. A.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am sorry. I do not want to get into that field.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that borrowed prosperity is always good for a while; that a man can live better off the borrowings than off the income from it?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman does not refer to this as borrowed prosperity; in wartime there is no borrowed prosperity. In wartime the situation is not at all normal.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the point; it is not normal.

Mr. PATMAN. We are doing things today that we would not even think of doing in peacetime; we are submitting to rules and regulations and even to regimentation gladly and willingly because it is in the interest of the war effort, things we would not even think of doing in times of peace. It is not just a question of comparing expenditure of public funds now with any time during peace periods. It is quite different.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will give me 2 minutes, I will relate something that happened in my business, since he asked me, and I am sure he will agree with me that I am right.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can always get time because we are always anxious to hear him.

Mr. RICH. I would like to put it in the RECORD in the gentleman's speech.

Mr. PATMAN. So far as O. P. A. is concerned, the gentleman would not have had any business if it were not for the O. P. A. You can talk about the O. P. A. all you want to and say it is annoying and irritating and that you do not like it, but without it we would not have anything on earth.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman misjudges me. I think he would enjoy this incident I want to relate.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is in favor of rationing and price control?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I am in sympathy with that.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman must expect some mistakes. Does he know how many prices are fixed? Eight million. There are 8,000,000 different prices fixed by the O. P. A. It is a marvelous job they are doing. I could not do it. I do not know whether the gentleman could or not. Generally, they have done an excellent job. Of course, there have been hardships and injustices, but corrections have been made, and under Mr. Bowles they have been made just a little bit quicker than they have been made in the past. I think the people are pleased when all things are considered.

Mr. RICH. When Mr. Brown was there they had an excellent man. No finer man ever lived than Brown. He tried to do it, but certain people harassed him so. He did not get the support of the administration, and he could not do the job. I think they are doing a better job now than they did formerly because they never gave the support to Brown they should, and there never was a finer man living than Brown from Michigan.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. It took a long time for the O. P. A. to get in the right channel and get everything done just right, and the reason was because so many prices had to be fixed.

The gentleman from Nebraska mentioned some other things about taxes on small business, and he put his finger on the very thing we are going to have to deal with in the post-war period. We have got to encourage private enterprise, initiative, and competition in business, and discourage monopoly. I think he is exactly right about that, and I will join him in any effort to do that. There is not one bit of an issue between the two parties on that. During the last campaign Mr. Roosevelt made it plain he was for private enterprise, the profit system, the competitive system, and small business. Mr. Dewey, the leader on the other side, made it plain he was in favor of the same thing. So there is no difference between the two parties on that question and we should all work shoulder to shoulder, we should all work together, in order to try to accomplish those things.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania always makes an interesting speech, and I am always glad to listen to him, but if he would spend more time on remedies than on diagnoses, I think he would be a little more helpful to all of us. If the gentleman will present his remedy for these things, something we can put on the table and say, "Here is what Congressman Rich says will correct this situation," then I will be glad to join him in trying to correct them; but to get up here and say that there are 3,000,000 employees of the Government, and there are, and say that a lot of them should be dismissed, is something different. Maybe they should, but he does not say which ones. That does not help us a bit. The gentleman should get down to introducing a bill which would provide that we should repeal certain laws and we should discharge certain people. If he will do that, he will find I will support him if I am sure that he is right.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman should just take the statement that was made by Senator BYRD and follow that up. He gave you a fair idea. You put that into effect and you will be doing what I would like to see done. I could not give you any better illustration than to just take the recommendations that Senator BYRD made to the Senate and put those into effect. Get behind him and the gentleman will be doing the country the greatest good that any man could possibly do.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman would be serving his cause better and he would be doing his cause more good if he would get down to specific recommendations. You know a lot of what Senator BYRD stated was rather general and not specific. I would like to see something specific, a real program. The gentleman has often talked about the New Deal and how bad it has been so far as the farm program is concerned, just as he mentioned awhile ago. Now, there are 28 New Deal laws, and I venture to say that if you would go back and look at the RECORD you would find a majority of our friends on the Republican side voted for every one of those laws. I will venture the further statement that there are not many Members on the Republican side who would vote to repeal one of them. I have not heard the gentleman say he was in favor of repealing any of them. I have heard him talking about the New Deal and condemning the New Deal generally, but I have not heard of any New Deal laws he was trying to repeal, and I refer to the so-called New Deal laws that were supported by both Democrats and Republicans. There has been a lot of talk about them, but nobody proposes to repeal them. Which law would the gentleman propose to repeal?

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For an answer to that question, yes.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman saw the letter that Mr. Biggers, of Texas, wrote about repealing the various alphabetical agencies and those he would repeal. Take any one of them or all of them, start in there, and the gentleman would be doing the country a lot of good.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is very general in his answer.

Mr. RICH. I will take the time and read a lot of them to the gentleman if he prefers.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman is going to base his argument upon what Mr. Biggers said, he is liable to get into trouble, because he had agencies on that list that do not exist and have not existed for 10 or 12 years. If the gentleman is going to O. K. everything Mr. Biggers said, he might find himself in difficulty. May I ask the gentleman, out of the 28 New Deal laws which have been passed, which ones would the gentleman openly advocate repealing? The gentleman talks about Mr. Biggers and Senator BYRD.

Mr. RICH. Let me talk about the Chief Executive.

Mr. PATMAN. No; do not talk about him. Just talk about the law.

Mr. RICH. These Executive orders that he made are called laws by the bureaucrats down here.

Mr. PATMAN. Which one is the gentleman in favor of repealing?

Mr. RICH. I would repeal a whole lot of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Name one of them.

Mr. RICH. I would repeal a lot of these directives in reference to the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. PATMAN. All right; introduce a bill.

Mr. RICH. I would start right there.

Mr. PATMAN. Introduce a bill. Has the gentleman introduced a bill to do that?

Mr. RICH. I could not get the gentleman's support.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not need my support.

Mr. RICH. Oh, you have 50 more Members over there. You are responsible for the legislation, and we have to point these things out to you and we will point these things out to you from time to time.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman was rather successful the other day with a solid Republican minority and a few on this side. He was successful in carrying his point.

Mr. RICH. And that was a grand thing to do.

Mr. PATMAN. How does the gentleman know that he could not carry his point on what he is attempting to do?

Mr. RICH. We are here to try to cut useless expenditures of Government funds, and we are going to work at it as hard as we know how.

Mr. PATMAN. I am anxious to know how many so-called New Deal laws the gentleman would repeal, and if he will insert them in the RECORD at this point or any other point I will appreciate it very much.

Mr. RICH. We will point them out.

Mr. PATMAN. Because I have heard so much talk about these New Deal laws and nobody has ever mentioned any New Deal laws that they would repeal.

Mr. RICH. This is the first time I was ever asked that question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman talks about how hard the people were against the New Deal, on these farm projects and all of that. The people have passed on it four different times; in 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and breaking all precedents since 1936, with the same man running. You all know how the people have spoken on this. In 1932 you—the Republican Party—received 59 electoral votes out of 531. In 1936 you received 8; in 1940 you received 82. The other day right here, when we witnessed the count, you received 99 electoral votes out of 531, and if you were allowed to cast all the electoral votes you received in 4 Presidential campaigns you would not receive enough

electoral votes to elect a President at one time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman just said that the Republican candidate of 1944 was not for any different program than Roosevelt.

Mr. PATMAN. On one point.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How does the gentleman know what the people are for?

Mr. PATMAN. On one point. There are hundreds of different issues. That is just one issue.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman just said "all the issues."

Mr. PATMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. She is mistaken. I am sorry the lady was not listening.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was trying to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] which laws he would repeal. I say repeal all the laws that are harassing the people. Those, however, are not laws. Those are directives. Those are the creatures of the bureaus giving power to the President.

Mr. PATMAN. Take gasoline rationing, which is harassing a lot of people, would the gentleman repeal that?

Mr. GROSS. I would at least hold it in check and make it reasonably sensible, because some of the directives are not within the jurisdiction of the Congress to repeal.

Mr. PATMAN. That is rather a general statement to make.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that rationing is being done perfectly?

Mr. PATMAN. No; nothing is being done perfectly. There is no such thing as exact justice, and we do not expect it.

Mr. GROSS. And do not call these directive laws, because they are not.

Mr. PATMAN. Go over to the Supreme Court Building and look at the inscription as you walk up the steps. You do not see "Exact justice" written there. You see "Equal justice under law." People are given equal justice, but they cannot be given exact justice. That is like condemning any party, like yours, because certain people are members of it; in other words, picking out the exceptional cases and saying they are the general rule. You can take any church or any organization, whether it is political, religious, fraternal, or regardless of what it is, and pick out certain members and say they represent the general rule, and you can condemn practically all organizations. We must not do that. We must consider the majority and not just the exceptional cases.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would like to give the gentleman a few of these bureaus that I

would repeal right away: Home Owners' Loan Corporation, National Archives Council, National Labor Relations Board, United States Housing Authority, Civil Works Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, Agricultural Marketing Service, Work Projects Administration. I could name a dozen of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer a few at a time. Do not read off a list of a hundred.

Mr. RICH. I am afraid the gentleman will not give me time to name a number of them.

Mr. PATMAN. I will take the first one, Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Here is an organization that has accomplished as much good for the people of this Nation as any other agency of Government. It has served its purpose and it is now being liquidated in a satisfactory way, and the Government will not lose any money. Just see what the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has done. It has reduced interest rates and saved millions of homes. Instead of having a half dozen mortgages, one, two, three, four, or five mortgages on one home, they just have one mortgage and pay one low rate of interest.

Do you know what the difference is under H. O. L. C. from what was the normal procedure before we had it? On a \$5,000 home, on 20 years' time, if you paid for it under the old system before H. O. L. C. you would pay \$1,600 more by the time you had paid for it in 20 years than what you would pay under the policy adopted by H. O. L. C.

The H. O. L. C. is in liquidation. It is going out just as fast as it can. It is not going to lose any money. It has saved millions of homes for the American people. I am proud of it, and I hope the gentleman will not say that he is against it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How many home owners did you close out after you took this over? Can the gentleman give us those figures, and put them in his speech right here?

Mr. PATMAN. They did not close out any. They saved every home that could be saved.

Mr. RICH. No; they did not.

Mr. PATMAN. They saved millions. Was the gentleman opposed to the H. O. L. C.? Of course, he was not opposed to it.

Mr. RICH. Clean it out.

Mr. PATMAN. What is the gentleman's objection? It is being liquidated. The Government will get every dime of its money back.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman said a moment ago it had outlived its usefulness.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not say it has outlived its usefulness. I said it did a good job and had served its purpose. It is not necessary now and it is being liquidated.

Mr. GROSS. Why did the gentleman oppose its liquidation?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not oppose its liquidation. I am for it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, the gentleman did. He has opposed the liquidation of every agency ever set up.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman mentioned the Commodity Credit Corporation. In order to induce the farmers to grow the necessary food and fiber, Congress very wisely put into the commodity credit law as a part of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act the provision the gentleman read awhile ago, that during this war and for 2 years thereafter the farmers shall be guaranteed a fair price for what they produce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Why did the Congress do that? In order to induce these people to produce with the knowledge that they would be adequately taken care of. If they were not given that promise and that assurance, they would not have produced 25 percent more last year than they ever produced in the history of this Nation. Therefore it was one of the wisest and best laws that was ever passed by the American Congress. Yet the gentleman is bold enough to say it should be repealed.

Mr. RICH. Yes. I say that honestly, because, instead of the Federal Government's paying for all these things and taking it out of the Treasury, I want to see the fellow that purchases that commodity pay for it. I want it to pay its own way and save this great deficit we are creating.

Mr. PATMAN. It is paying its own way.

The gentleman has picked out two of the finest examples of using Government credit in the interest of the common, general welfare, without loss to the Treasury of the United States, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation. When they are both liquidated the Government of the United States, I predict, will not be out any money, yet it has saved millions and millions for the people.

Mr. RICH. I disagree with the gentleman that when they are liquidated it will not cost the Government one penny. It is costing the Government plenty. If the gentleman will give me time, I should like to discuss it right now. I cannot do it in just a word.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope it will not take too long, as I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. I will give it briefly with reference to the commodity with which I am most familiar—wool. I am a woolen manufacturer. When the Government took over the wool for this period and set the price on domestic wools, it embarked upon an operation under which the Government is today accumu-

lating all the domestic wools. The foreign wools are coming into this country, and all we can do is buy foreign wools, because the domestic wools are 18 to 20 cents a pound more than the foreign wools. The fact is that the Government is holding the bag now. We are not using domestic wools. All the manufacturers are buying foreign wools because they can buy them more cheaply.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about the situation to which the gentleman is referring.

Mr. RICH. The only way they can use domestic wools is in connection with Government contracts where domestic wools are specified.

Mr. PATMAN. Maybe a mistake is being made; I do not know. I am not going to cuss the Government because it makes 1 mistake out of 8,000,000 prices. There are 8,000,000 different commodities.

Mr. RICH. We show you these things and we want you to try to correct them.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly; introduce a bill.

Mr. RICH. How far would any bill I introduced on this side of the House get? It would not get to the committee. They would not listen to it because it would have the name "RICH" tacked onto it. They would say, "He is a Republican. We do not want any Republican bills."

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I am sure the Members of the House would give sympathetic consideration to any proposal introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I know that I would. So I hope in the near future that instead of paying too much attention to all these things about the number of methods and about the different things that are worrying the country, I just hope he will give us constructive proposals, including necessary and proper adjustments.

Mr. RICH. I will submit them to you. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

NEED OF AMMUNITION AT THE FRONT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, when the Military Affairs Committee of the House returned from its inspection trip overseas recently the newspapers carried back to France a brief story of a visit which I made to the German front in the company of one of the officers of the Army engineers. This story referred to the fact that I had met five soldiers on the front within a short distance of Duren, Germany, who were engaged in laying communication lines to the Infantry. I asked these men where the enemy was, and they pointed to a church steeple ahead about one-half mile. "That is a German observation post," they said. I asked why they did not do something about it, and they replied that they would do something about it if they had the ammunition.

This morning I received the following letter:

GERMANY, December 23, 1944.
HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are the Signal Corps soldiers of whom you made reference in the enclosed clipping. For the sake of posterity, we would like you to know that we are field artillerymen and were engaged in wire-laying operations on the day you saw us. Subsequently, we used that German observation post for one of our own.

We sincerely hope that you have been successful in convincing the people back home that we are in dire need of more shells.

We continue well and happy, but wouldn't 30 days in the States be like heaven on earth.

Sgt. ROBERT ROSOWSKY,
New York, N. Y.
Cpl. BRAXTON LOVETTE,
North Carolina.
T/5 ROBERT M. RANDELL,
North Carolina.
T/5 WARREN E. FERRELL,
New Jersey.
Pvt. ROBERT W. HICKS,
North Carolina.

[Enclosure]

HOUSE GROUP, BACK IN UNITED STATES, WILL
REPORT TO GENERAL MARSHALL

WASHINGTON, December 21.—Members of the House Military Committee, back from a month-long tour of the western and Italian fronts, reported today that they found "everything going well, although more ammunition could be used." Representative OVERTON BROOKS (Democrat, Louisiana) said the committee was "satisfied" with things in general, although "some shortage" of shells was noticeable. On one occasion, he said, the group was less than a mile from a German observation post when a Signal Corps soldier commented, "If we had enough shells we could get that lookout."

Once the party was within rifle shot of German soldiers at Duren.

Although the Congressmen declined to discuss in detail what they had seen until they had conferred with General Marshall and Secretary of War Stimson, they left these impressions with interviewers, the Associated Press reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LAFOLLETTE for 30 days, beginning January 10, 1945, on account of necessary business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 9, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

87. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a statement showing the names and compensation of the members and employees of the Federal Power Commission as of June 30, 1944, pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Power Act, approved August 26, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

88. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of certain legislation, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States,

approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the municipal councils in the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

89. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting copies of the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

90. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

91. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting statements showing the names for whom work has been performed, the nature of the services rendered, the price charged for these services, and the manner in which the moneys received were deposited or used; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

92. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

93. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the \$3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

94. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the eleventh report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended September 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 21); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

95. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a report of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law No. 46 cumulative for the period beginning January 1, 1944, and ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

96. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co., a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York, which the War Department recommends to be enacted into law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 29. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 12, 1942, submitting a review of reports on harbors of Cape Charles, Va., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 30. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of

Engineers, United States Army, dated June 12, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Atlantic-Gulf ship canal, Florida, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 39. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Miami River, Fla., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 40. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1942, submitting a review of reports on Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed with two illustrations, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 41. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Shipyard River, S. C., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 42. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 3, 1941, submitting a review of reports on Redwood Creek, Calif., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 43. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1942, submitting a review of reports on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 44. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 27, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Intracoastal Waterway from Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La., including the Violet Canal route, Louisiana, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with two illustrations, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 50. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct studies and examinations of executive agencies to assist it in the determination of matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:
H. R. 1159. A bill to provide for the total mobilization of the Nation's manpower in the present war by the creation of a third branch of the national defense forces, to be known as the Supply Forces; to prescribe liability for training and service therein, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 1160. A bill to grant to personnel in the military or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leaves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 1161. A bill to provide eligibility for adjusted compensation to provisional, temporary, and probationary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1162. A bill to provide for issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to any veteran who establishes that the original has been lost or destroyed, or is being withheld or concealed from him, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 1163. A bill to authorize a survey of the military route of Gen. Anthony Wayne during the Indian wars, with a view to constructing a national parkway to be known as the General Anthony Wayne Memorial Parkway; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1164. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1165. A bill providing free laundry and dry-cleaning service to members of the military and naval forces while on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1166. A bill to confer on the district courts of the United States jurisdiction of certain cases involving children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1167. A bill to confer on the district courts of the United States jurisdiction of certain proceedings involving support for children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1168. A bill to abolish the War Damage Corporation and to provide for the refund of unabsorbed premiums for war-damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1169. A bill to give veterans preferential rights to purchase jeeps and other military vehicles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1170. A bill to exclude from income tax the compensation of persons in the military or naval service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1171. A bill to provide for a United States air-mail postal card; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 1172. A bill to raise the minimum wage rate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1173. A bill prescribing new postal rates for air mail other than the first class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 1174. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 1175. A bill granting annual and sick leave to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1176. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1177. A bill to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the merchant marine who serve after September 28, 1941, and during the present war as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who serve during the present war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1178 (by request). A bill to remove foreign patenting as a bar to United States patent unless such foreign patenting occurred more than 12 months prior to application for United States patent; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 1179 (by request). A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 1180. A bill to permit the occupancy of vacant living accommodations in national defense housing projects by certain wives of members of the armed forces and by war veterans with wives or children; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 1181. A bill to provide for renewal of certain copyrights; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1182. A bill to eliminate the income limitation as to eligibility for pensions to the widows of certain World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1183. A bill to amend section 1 (c) of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 28, 1934, as amended by Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, and section 11 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 13, 1943; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1184. A bill to authorize Slater Branch Bridge and Road Club to construct, maintain, and operate a free suspension bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Williamson, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1185. A bill to prohibit the sale or other disposition of certain naval property without specific authorization by the Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1186. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1187. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of Alsea Bay, Oreg., with a view to constructing a harbor of refuge; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1188. A bill to authorize the Director of the Census to issue certifications of birth records; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1189. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of supervisors of the first- and second-class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 1190. A bill to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents in the case of persons who serve in the land or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 1191. A bill to provide for the assignment after the war of certain patent rights of the United States to the servicemen who made the inventions and discoveries patented; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1192. A bill granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1193 (by request). A bill to provide a night differential for employees of the Government of the United States and of the Government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 1194. A bill to prescribe 48 hours as the standard workweek during the present war; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SHAFFER:

H. R. 1195. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. R. 1196. A bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1197. A bill to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1198. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1199. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1200. A bill to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma and conveyances in the State of Oklahoma where Indian lands of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians are involved; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1201. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1202. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress (pocket vetoed); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1203. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1204. A bill to change the time of the appointment of Presidential electors and the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. R. 1205. A bill to enable intervention by a State in any suit in any court of the United States in which it has an interest, involving the constitutionality, construction, or application of an act of Congress or an act of a State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1206. A bill to prescribe fair standards of administrative procedure and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1207. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1208. A bill providing for the incorporation of The National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, organized December 10, 1847; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1209. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1210. A bill to authorize the erection of a Veterans Administration general medical and surgical hospital and domiciliary facility in eastern Pennsylvania; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1211. A bill to authorize revision of the tribal roll of the Eastern Band of Chero-

kee Indians, North Carolina; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1212. A bill authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the successors thereof, to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Laredo, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 1213. A bill to provide that credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be allowed for certain service in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1214 (by request). A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1939 (Public Law No. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1215. A bill providing for veterans' rehabilitation, preventing unemployment, chaos, and confusion at the end of the war and promoting individual, productive enterprise by enabling the returned veterans to engage in such enterprises and employ themselves in place of asking for jobs that do not exist; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1216. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon certain United States commissioners to try misdemeanors committed on Federal reservations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that no Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected or within 2 years after the expiration of such time, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize the passage of legislation, notwithstanding a Presidential veto, by a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to create a joint committee from the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate and report as to how the Federal Government may get relief from the overburden of its governmental responsibilities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Res. 59. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution No. 10; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 60. Resolution authorizing the continuation of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Res. 61. Resolution to establish an Office of Fiscal Investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

H. Res. 62. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to investigate the progress of the defense housing program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 63. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on Education of the effect

of certain war activities on colleges and universities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 64. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. Res. 65. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House so as to grant to standing committees the power of subpoena; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. Res. 66. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate various activities in the departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 67. Resolution to investigate the Bank of International Settlements; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 1217. A bill for the relief of Hutchinson's Boat Works, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHARP:

H. R. 1218. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Merrick, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1219. A bill for the relief of Bruns Kimball & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of the Channel Boat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of the Mount Desert Boat Yard, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of the Fair Haven Yacht Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1223. A bill for the relief of the Harbor Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1224. A bill for the relief of the San Pedro Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1225. A bill for the relief of the Channel Boat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1226. A bill for the relief of Reed Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1227. A bill for the relief of S. B. Norton & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1228. A bill for the relief of Kam N. Kathju; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1229. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary M. Wolf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Donna May McNulty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1231. A bill for the relief of Henry S. Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1232. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edward B. Formanek; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1233. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to Laban P. Hilton, in recognition of his valor in saving from drowning eight of his fellow citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Percy Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1235. A bill for the relief of John Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to quit claim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the County of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1237. A bill for the relief of Albert K. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Father Peter B. Duffee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1239. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1240. A bill to provide a pension for Mrs. James Gardiner Conroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1241. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. Meersman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 1242. A bill for the relief of W. S. Dean; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. J. Rhea, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1244. A bill relative to the military record of Charles C. Rascoe, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1245. A bill for the relief of John F. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1246. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Hinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1247. A bill granting a pension to Emma Hellwig; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1248. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Caisse; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1249. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Frazee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Councilman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1251. A bill for the relief of the Irvine Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1252. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1253. A bill to permit the naturalization of Raymundo Gonzales, Santa Ana, Calif.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1254. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. A. McDowell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1255. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Minta P. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1256. A bill for the relief of the persons named; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1257. A bill for the relief of George C. Tyler and Doris M. Tyler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1258. A bill for the relief of Cecil Atkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 1259. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to present a decoration of the Purple Heart and a silver victory button to Charles A. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1260. A bill for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1261. A bill for the relief of Ina Young Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1262. A bill for the relief of W. E. Noah; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1263. A bill for the relief of E. E. Armstrong; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1264. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John P. Maher, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1265. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Reynold O. Gilks; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1266. A bill for the relief of the Transit Investment Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1267. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archie S. Woods, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1268. A bill for the relief of Baxter Campbell and Glestie Campbell Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1269. A bill for the relief of Virge McClure; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1270. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of the First Suczawaer Sick and Benevolent Society to bring about the realization and intent of the Balfour Declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of employees of the city of Reading, Pa., urging that social security legislation be adopted to extend social-security benefits to municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5. Also, resolution of the City Council of the City of Reading, Pa., urging that social-security legislation be adopted to extend social-security benefits to municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of 941 citizens of Vermont protesting against any further prohibition legislation by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7. By Mr. SHAFER: Resolution of the Michigan Council of Church Women disapproving conscription of 17-year-olds and urging appointment of a woman as member of the peace commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution passed by the County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of preventing further acquisition of real property by the people of the Japanese race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, city of Chicago, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the Federal Aid Road Act; to the Committee on Roads.

10. Also, petition of Local Union No. 1111 of the United Mine Workers of America resolving that it is unanimously on record that since the Miner's Legislative and Political Action Committee is not their representative, the members of this local union propose to do everything in their power to abolish this committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11. Also, petition of the secretary, Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, petitioning consideration of their

resolution with reference to the fish and game resources on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

12. Also, petition of the Vancouver Sales & Appraisers, Ltd., protesting against undue delay in the payment of just claims submitted to the United States Public Roads Administration by the above-mentioned petitioner; to the Committee on Claims.

13. Also, petition of Rabbi Moses Reingewirtz requesting the publishing of his works on Daas H'Totah; to the Committee on the Library.

14. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Butler County Pomona Grange, No. 17, Pennsylvania, opposing compulsory military training in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

15. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. O. W. Hutson and 26 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging favorable action on the Peterson bill, H. R. 5477; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

16. By Mr. JARMAN: Fifteen petitions of 324 citizens of the Sixth District of Alabama protesting against the consideration by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

17. By Mr. TAYLOR: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Saratoga County, N. Y., January 9, 1945, registering its opposition to the creation of a seaway through the St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes and the development and construction of electric power facilities at tremendous cost to the Government, fully unwarranted and unjustified; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Saviour of mankind, to whom our unexpressed hopes are plain and the throbs of our hearts are audible, consider and hear our prayer. We are humbly aware of our low estate and pray that we may come to the riches of the goodness and grace of the Divine as taught by the Teacher of Nazareth. Thou who knowest us altogether, forgive our sins of thought, of imagination, of strength, and of weakness; consume the dross in any unworthy ambitions.

Heavenly Father, many there are who have left our shores and have looked upon our glowing and receding skies for the last time. Fill their cup of loneliness and sorrow with great peace and with the assurance of work well done. God Himself is making the wrath of these sons of liberty to praise Him and become a redemptive force in the affairs of this world. While they are being tested to the last extremity of perils which gather with piercing power, enable us to nerve the centers of our wills against all fears and doubts. O God, give us a larger portion of Thy spirit that we may complete the task entrusted to us in self-surrender, sacrifice, and courage. We pray that we may be made worthy of the tremendous price of freedom, and with the blessed hope of eternal life may face not the night but the morning. In the holy name

of Him whose scepter is love we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 8, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that some Members-elect are present who have not taken the oath of office. If they will present themselves at the bar of the House, they may take the oath of office now.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON and Mr. ALVIN F. WEICHEL took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—1946 BUDGET

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed:

BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the Budget for the fiscal year 1946 as fighting all over the globe reaches a climax of fury. We on the home front must back our fighting men and women to the limit. That is our supreme duty. At the same time we must look ahead. We must be ready to throw our whole effort into the campaign against Japan as fast as the war in Europe permits. And finally, we must begin plans to transform an all-cut war economy into a full-employment peace economy whenever demobilization becomes possible. Programs for all these developments must be considered in budget planning for a period that extends over 18 months.

We must make sure that our armed forces can plan their procurement programs for continuing global war. I shall transmit detailed recommendations for war appropriations by early spring, in time for the Congress to act on these requests before the beginning of the new fiscal year. I estimate now that 73 billion dollars of appropriations and authorizations will be needed for war purposes for the fiscal year 1946.

If the war develops favorably, unobligated balances of war appropriations no longer required for authorized purposes will be placed in reserve and reported to the Congress for repeal or other action under the provisions of present law.

Actual expenditures of the Federal Government depend largely on the course of the war. I have not made in the past, and I shall not now make, any prediction concerning the length of the war. My only prediction is that our enemies will be totally defeated before we lay down our arms. Depending on various assumptions which may reason-

ably be made with respect to the course of the war, estimates of war expenditures for the fiscal year 1946 range from less than 60 to more than 80 billion dollars. I propose to use 70 billion dollars as a tentative estimate of war expenditures for the fiscal year 1946. I repeat, however—the rate of actual spending must depend on developments on the battle fronts.

For purposes other than war, I am recommending appropriations, in general and special accounts, to cover estimated expenditures of 13 billion dollars.

Total appropriations and authorizations (including reappropriations and permanent appropriations) for war and other purposes reached a peak of 128 billion dollars for the last complete fiscal year that ended June 30, 1944; 97 billion dollars have been appropriated for the current fiscal year; and I estimate now that 87 billion dollars will be recommended to the Congress for the next fiscal year.

Total expenditures for war and other purposes (in general and special accounts and net outlays of Government corporations, excluding debt retirement) were 95 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1944; they are now estimated at 100 billion dollars for the current fiscal year; and, on the basis of the tentative estimates of war expenditures, they will be 83 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1946.

I propose no substantial change in tax legislation at this time. Revenues are expected to decline somewhat under the influence of the estimated decline in expenditures. The Federal debt is estimated to reach 252 billion dollars on June 30, 1945, and 292 billion dollars 12 months later.

The 1946 Budget is summarized in charts and tables following this Message. In the subsequent sections I comment on appropriations, expenditures, and revenues under existing legislation, and make suggestions for future legislation.

THE WAR PROGRAM

EXPENDITURES FOR THE WAR PROGRAM

Early in the war we had the threefold task of building up a new munitions industry in this country, producing the equipment and means of transportation for our expanding armed forces, and aiding our Allies in their resistance against the aggressors. The record today shows that we have spent 28 billion dollars since July 1, 1940, to build munitions factories, cantonments, depots, hospitals, war housing, and for other war construction. Three times the total strength of our Army and Navy at the time of Pearl Harbor is now fighting or deployed overseas. Thirty-six billion dollars of lend-lease aid have been furnished in goods and services to our Allies, who in turn have aided us with approximately 4.5 billion dollars' worth of goods and services.

We have now substantially completed our war construction. Expenditures for war construction, which in the fiscal year 1943 reached a peak of 12.7 billion dollars, are now down to an annual rate